

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by
BENJAMIN D. MERITT

KEMP MALONE, HENRY T. ROWELL

Honorary Editor
DAVID MOORE ROBINSON

VOLUME LXVI

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

LONDON: ARTHUR F. BIRD

PARIS: ALBERT FONTEMOING

LEIPZIG: F. A. BROCKHAUS

1945

159

CONTENTS OF VOLUME LXVI.

No. 261.

	PAGE
Beating the Oaks; an Interpretation of <i>Christ</i> 678-9. By HERBERT MERITT,	1
Notes on Tacitus. By G. B. A. FLETCHER,	13
The Monkeys of Archilochus. By FRIEDRICH WALTER LENZ,	34
The Text and Interpretation of the Theodosian Code, 6, 4, 21. By CLYDE PHARR,	50
The Golden Bough of Plato. By AGNES KIRSOFF MICHELS,	59
Did Menander Nod? <i>Epitrepones</i> 53 (94 K. ²). By P. MAAS,	63
REVIEWS:	64

История Философии (History of Philosophy). Vol. I: Philosophy of Ancient and Feudalistic Society. Edited by G. F. Aleksandrov, B. E. Bichovsky, M. B. Mitin, P. F. Yudin (PHILLIP DE LACY).—*Rogers' Studies in the Reign of Tiberius*. Some Imperial Virtues of Tiberius; Drusus Julius Caesar (HARRY J. LEON).—*Marsh's Modern Problems in the Ancient World* (WALTER R. AGARD).—*Trevelyan's Goethe and the Greeks* (LUDWIG EDELSTEIN).—*Donahue's The Theory of Literary Kinds*—Ancient Classifications of Literature (WARREN E. BLAKE).—*Hatcher's Reflexive Verbs*: Latin, Old French, Modern French (RAYMOND THOMPSON HILL).—*Read's Michigan Manuscript 18 of the Gospels* (BRUCE M. METZGER).—*Moody's Iohannis Buridanus Quaestiones super Libris Quattuor de Caelo et Mundo* (CHARLES W. JONES).—*Cicero, Brutus*, with an English translation by G. L. Hendrickson; *Orator*, with an English translation by H. M. Hubbell (Loeb Class. Library) (HARRY CAPLAN).—*Erikson's Sancti Epiphanii Episcopi Interpretatio Evangeliorum* (HARRY CAPLAN).—*Erikson's Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Epiphanius' Interpretatio Evangeliorum* (HARRY CAPLAN).—*Sedgefield's Locorum nonnullorum in epistulis M. T. Ciceronis mendose descriptorum emendationes* (GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH).—*Solmsen's Plato's Theology* (E. FRANK).—*Duckworth's The Complete Roman Drama*: All the extant comedies of Plautus and Terence and the tragedies of Seneca in a variety of translations. Edited, and with an introduction (WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER).—*Braun's History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature* (W. F. ALBRIGHT).—*Winlock's The Temple of Hibis in El Khārgēh Oasis. Part I: The Excavations* (W. F. ALBRIGHT).—*Edelstein's The Hippocratic Oath: Text, Translation and Interpretation* (EDWIN L. MINAR, JR.).—*Rider's The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library, A Problem and Its Solution* (HENRY B. VAN HOESEN).

BOOKS RECEIVED, 111

No. 262.

	PAGE
Pericles and his Colleagues between 441 and 429 B. C. By VICTOR EHRENBERG, - - - - -	113
A Thirteenth Century Formula of Anathema. By CLYDE PHARR, - - - - -	135
<i>Aerarium</i> and <i>Fiscus</i> during the Early Empire. By C. H. V. SUTHERLAND, - - - - -	151
Isocrates' Fellow-Rhetoricians. By STANLEY WILCOX, - - - - -	171
Homer and Hector. By JOHN A. SCOTT, - - - - -	187
Note on the Alexandrian Calendar. By DUNCAN MACNAUGHTON, - - - - -	189
<i>Moralia</i> 614 E. By PAUL A. CLEMENT, - - - - -	192
Γερουσία—Γερωχία. By KURT VON FRITZ, - - - - -	196
REVIEWS: - - - - -	198
Smith and Miller's The Iliad of Homer, A Line for Line Translation in Dactylic Hexameters (WARREN E. BLAKE).— <i>Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies</i> , Vol. I, No. 2 (M. L. W. LAISTNER).—Balogh and Heichelheim's Political Refugees in Ancient Greece from the Period of the Tyrants to Alexander the Great (HANS JULIUS WOLFF).—Bloch and Trager's Outline of Linguistic Analysis (HANS KURATH).—Rand's The Building of Eternal Rome (MARBURY B. OGLE).—Cherf, Corey, McNeil, Strout, Catterall, Steiner, and Jameson's Studies in the Text Tradition of St. Jerome's <i>Vitae Patrum</i> , edited by Oldfather and others (DOROTHY M. ROBATHAN).—Delatte's Anecdota Atheniensia et Alia, Tome II: Textes Grecs Relatifs à l'Histoire des Sciences (I. E. DRABKIN).— <i>Berytus</i> , Archeological Studies published by the Museum of Archeology of the American University of Beirut, Vol. VIII, fasc. I (DORO LEVI).—Markman's The Horse in Greek Art (A. E. RAUBITSCHEK).—Mueller's The Vocabulary of Pope St. Leo the Great (JOSEPH M. F. MARIQUE, S. J.).—Kennedy's The Earliest English Poetry: A Critical Survey of the Poetry Written before the Norman Conquest, with Illustrative Translations (HERBERT MERITT).	

No. 263.

St. Jerome's Testimony Concerning the Second Grade of Mithraic Initiation. By BRUCE M. METZGER, - - - - -	225
Three Attic Inscriptions. By BENJAMIN D. MERITT, - - - - -	234
Athenian Politics, 510-486 B. C. By C. A. ROBINSON, JR., - - - - -	243
A Note on <i>I.G.</i> , I ² , 87. By BENJAMIN D. MERITT, - - - - -	254
The Text of Gratian's <i>Decretum</i> II, 32, 4, 5. By CLYDE PHARR, - - - - -	255
The First Chapter of the <i>Poetics</i> . By FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR., - - - - -	266
Spitzer's Grail Etymology. By WILLIAM A. NITZE, - - - - -	279
The <i>Numquid Vis</i> Formula in Roman Comedy. By JOHN N. HOUGH, - - - - -	282
A Definitive Note on the Enthymeme. By SOLOMON SIMONSON, - - - - -	303

CONTENTS.

V
PAGE

Two Latin Inscriptions at Indiana University. By DONALD W. PRAKKEN, - - - - -	307
Brief Notes on "The Vernacular Proverb in Mediaeval Latin Prose." By †W. A. OLDFATHER, - - - - -	310
Two Notes on the <i>Agamemnon</i> of Aeschylus. By RICHMOND LATTIMORE, - - - - -	313
REVIEWS: - - - - -	315
Richardson's Poetical Theory in Republican Rome (GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH).—Leonard and Smith's <i>T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura, Libri Sex</i> ; Edited with Introduction and Commentary (PAUL FRIEDLÄNDER).—Kramer's Sumerian Mythology. A Study of Spiritual and Literary Achievement in the Third Millennium B. C. (CHARLES T. FRITSCH).—Taubenschlag's The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri, 332 B. C.—640 A. D. (HANS JULIUS WOLFF).—Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, Vol. LXXIV (A. E. RAUBITSCHEK).—Maat's A Rhetorical Study of St. John Chrysostom's <i>De Sacerdotio</i> (FRIEDRICH WALTER LENZ).	
BOOKS RECEIVED, - - - - -	335

No. 264.

Socrates Enters Rome. By PAUL FRIEDLÄNDER, - - - - -	337
The Meaning of the <i>Pharsalia</i> . By BERTHE M. MARTI, - - - - -	352
The Use of Stage Business to Portray Emotion in Greek Tragedy. By FAMEE LORENE SHISLER, - - - - -	377
Comic Iteration in Aristophanes. By HAROLD W. MILLER, - - - - -	398
An Allusion to a Riddle in Suetonius. By ARCHER TAYLOR, - - - - -	408
The Conciliar and Civil Calendar in I. G., I ² , 324. By JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS, - - - - -	411
Pliny, <i>Naturalis Historia</i> , XVIII, 97. By D'ARCY W. THOMPSON, - - - - -	414
REVIEWS: - - - - -	417
Greene's <i>Moira</i> . Fate, Good, and Evil in Greek Thought (KURT VON FRITZ).—Lutz' Dunchad: <i>Glossae in Martianum</i> (PAUL OSKAR KRISTELLER).—Tolles' The Banquet-Liberations of the Greeks (GEORGE W. ELDERKIN).—Rostovtzeff, Bellinger, Brown, and Welles' The Excavations at Dura-Europos. Preliminary Report of the Ninth Season of Work, 1935-1936. Part I: The Agora and Bazaar (DAVID M. ROBINSON).—Jaffee's Horace: An Essay in Poetic Therapy (DOROTHY M. ROBATHAN).—Tillyard's The Elizabethan World Picture (DON CAMERON ALLEN).—McGeachy's Quintus Aurelius Symmachus and the Senatorial Aristocracy of the West (TOM B. JONES).	
INDEX TO VOLUME LXVI, - - - - -	437

MAR 21 1945

VOL. LXVI, 1

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH

WHOLE No. 261

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

HAROLD F. CHERNISS, KEMP MALONE
HENRY T. ROWELL

Honorary Editor

DAVID MOORE ROBINSON

JANUARY, 1945

BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Beating the Oaks; an Interpretation of <i>Christ</i> 678-9. By HERBERT MERITT,	1
Notes on Tacitus. By G. B. A. FLETCHER,	13
The Monkeys of Archilochus. By FRIEDRICH WALTER LENZ,	34
The Text and Interpretation of the Theodosian Code, 6, 4, 21. By CLYDE PHARR,	50
The Golden Bough of Plato. By AGNES KIRSOOP MICHELS,	59
Did Menander Nod? <i>Epitrepones</i> 53 (94 K. ³). By P. MAAS,	63
REVIEWS:	64

ИСТОРИЯ ФИЛОСОФИИ (History of Philosophy). Vol. I: Philosophy of Ancient and Feudalistic Society. Edited by G. F. Aleksandrov, B. E. Bichovsky, M. B. Mitin, P. F. Yudin (PHILLIP DE LACY).—Rogers' Studies in the Reign of Tiberius. Some Imperial Virtues of Tiberius; Drusus Julius Caesar (HARRY J. LEON).—Marsh's Modern Problems in the Ancient World (WALTER R. AGARD).—Trevelyan's Goethe and the Greeks (LUDWIG EDELSTEIN).—Donahue's The Theory of Literary Kinds—Ancient Classifications of Literature (WARREN E. BLAKE).—Hatcher's Reflexive Verbs: Latin, Old French, Modern French (RAYMOND THOMPSON HILL).—Read's Michigan Manuscript 18 of the Gospels (BRUCE M. METZGER).—Moody's Iohannis Buridani Quaestiones super Libris Quattuor de Caelo et Mundo (CHARLES W. JONES).—Cicero, *Brutus*, with an English translation by G. L. Hendrickson; *Orator*, with an English translation by H. M. Hubbell (Loeb Class. Library) (HARRY CAPLAN).—Erikson's Sancti Epiphanii Episcopi Interpretatio Evangeliorum (HARRY CAPLAN).—Erikson's Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Epiphanius' Interpretatio Evangeliorum (HARRY CAPLAN).—Sedgefield's Locorum nonnullorum in epistulis M. T. Ciceronis mendose descriptorum emendationes (GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH).—Solmsen's Plato's Theology (E. FRANK).—Duckworth's The Complete Roman Drama: All the extant comedies of Plautus and Terence and the tragedies of Seneca in a variety of translations. Edited, and with an introduction (WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER).—Braun's History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature (W. F. ALBRIGHT).—Winlock's The Temple of Hibis in El Khārgeh Oasis. Part I: The Excavations (W. F. ALBRIGHT).—Edelstein's The Hippocratic Oath: Text, Translation and Interpretation (EDWIN L. MINAR, JR.).—Rider's The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library, A Problem and Its Solution (HENRY B. VAN HOESEN).

BOOKS RECEIVED,	111
-----------------	-----

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology, and especially in the field of Greek and Roman studies. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage 25 cents extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the editor, Benjamin D. Meritt; proof should be returned to the secretary, Evelyn H. Clift, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

Contributors are entitled to receive twenty-five copies of their respective contributions free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances, and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore 18, Md.

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LXVI, 1

WHOLE No. 261

BEATING THE OAKS; AN INTERPRETATION OF *CHRIST* 678-9.

In the Old English poem *Christ*, the poet Cynewulf throughout some twenty lines enumerates various abilities with which God has endowed mankind. Some can pluck the harp; some are successful warriors; some can navigate a ship; some know far paths; some can make a sword.¹ Among the lines stating these and other recognizable accomplishments, there occurs at line 678 the locution *sum mæg heanne beam stælgne gestigan*. Probably most readers of the *Christ* would be inclined to translate this "some can climb the high, steep tree," were it not for the fact that such an accomplishment seems rather indefinite and perhaps not dignified enough for inclusion among the other gifts. A considerable amount of interpretation has grown up about the passage. It has been taken to refer to athletics in general;² emendation of *gestigan* to *gestiepan* has been suggested, the passage then referring to the craft of carpentry—"one can raise aloft the high timber"—and the same end has been reached by taking *gestigan* to mean "to raise aloft";³ the suggestion has

¹ It is likely that in medieval Biblical exposition there has been an expansion of the list of God's gifts to men set forth in Corinthians I, 12, and that such an expansion influenced Cynewulf's lines. An instance of how the passage in Corinthians might have been expanded to include such matters as husbandry, carpentry, and household duties may be seen in Haymo's exposition of Corinthians I, 12; Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, CXVII, col. 577.

² *The Christ of Cynewulf*, ed. A. Cook (Boston, 1900), p. 137.

³ G. Gerould, "Cynewulf's *Christ* 678-679," *M. L. N.*, XXXI, pp. 403 f.; and "Carpenter or Athlete? *Christ* vv. 678-9," *J. E. G. P.*, XXVIII, pp. 161-5.

been made that the passage alludes to Anglo-Saxon frivolities;⁴ and the passage has been translated "one ascendeth upon the steep, high cross."⁵ In support of a reference to tree climbing in the passage, a number of tasks have been mentioned to which this activity might be specifically applied, such as the duties of a watchman or of one who takes eyases from nests in connection with hawking.⁶ Attention has also been called to a passage in Aelfric's homilies wherein a herdsman in the performance of his duty climbed an oak and fed his livestock with the leafy top.⁷ No interpretation of the passage has had sufficient corroborative evidence to make it particularly convincing. The present interpretation starts with the belief that the passage means "some can climb the high, steep tree"; if there is determinable a specific, widely recognized, and not undignified activity to which the passage can clearly refer, it becomes no longer any more moot than the accompanying ones referring to the navigating of a ship and the making of a sword. The passage may refer to the climbing of oaks in order to beat down acorns for swine; concerning the beating of oaks as a recognized task throughout

⁴ F. Klaeber, *Anglia*, LIII, p. 233: "There are two alternatives before us. Either we change *gestigan* to *gestipan* and rejoice in a resulting highly appropriate sense of the passage. Or we show faith in the superior wisdom of the scribe who strangely penned *gestigan* and venture to derive a certain satisfaction from finding an unexpected allusion to Anglo-Saxon frivolities."

⁵ C. Kennedy, *The Poems of Cynewulf* (New York, 1910), p. 173. Gerould, *J. E. G. P.*, XXVIII, p. 161, objects to this on the ground that the allusion could then be only to Christ. I think that some case could be made out for an allusion to martyrdom in general, but I find nothing strongly convincing to support this.

⁶ E. Howard, "Old English Tree Climbing: Christ vv. 678-79," *J. E. G. P.*, XXX, pp. 152-4. Howard points out that a passage in the *Fortunes of Men*, wherein a man meets his fate by falling from a tree, indicates that tree climbing played a part in the lives of some men in the Old English period. A bit of support concerning tree climbing as part of a watchman's duty may be found in the Bayeux Tapestry, where a watchman upon a tree scans the distance with hand-shaded eye in order to provide information for William. Cf. *The Bayeux Tapestry*, elucidated by J. Bruce (London, 1856), plate III and p. 50.

⁷ B. Whiting, "A Further Note on Old English Tree Climbing: Christ vv. 678-79," *J. E. G. P.*, XXXI, pp. 256-7. He notes the earlier versions of this account in the anonymous *Vita S. Cuthberti* and in Bede's *Vita S. Cuthberti*.

a long period of English life there is much corroborative evidence, and that climbing a tree was a recognized part of this task can be amply substantiated.

It is essential to remark at first that the beating of acorns from oaks was not at all an Anglo-Saxon frivolity; as may be seen from laws, wills, and charters, swine constituted an important part of the livestock of the Anglo-Saxons, and the care of fattening them was a matter of officially recognized importance. The seventh century laws of Ine state specifically the payments for pasturage: if one takes payment for mast for swine, one receives every third hog with three-finger-thick bacon, every fourth hog with two-finger-thick bacon, every fifth hog with thumb-thick bacon.⁸ Anglo-Saxon wills include bequests of swine and provision for mast; for example, from the ninth century will of an alderman named Alfred: *twa ðusendu swina ic heom sello mid þem londum*,⁹ and from the eleventh century will of Aelfhelm: *ic wylle þat man mæste minum wife twa hund swina ðænne þær mæsten sy.*¹⁰ Concerning herds numbering two thousand swine, it may be mentioned that Alfred thought it worth noting that while Ohthere was one of the foremost men in Norway, he owned, in addition to other livestock, only twenty swine;¹¹ and as late as the sixteenth century Harrison in his *Description of England* tells us that those who live near oaks "doo cherish and bring up innumerable heards of swine."¹² A charter dated 825 states that at a synodal meeting at Clovesho, attended by King Beornwulf of Mercia with his bishops and aldermen, a chief topic of discussion was the amount of wood pasturage at Sutton; this pasturage the swineherds wished to extend further than the old rights allowed, while the bishop and the witnesses from the monastery maintained that they were liable for no more than mast for three hundred swine. Specific mention is made that at that time at Sutton, Hama was *swangerefa*,

⁸ F. Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, I, 110, sect. 49, 3.

⁹ B. Thorpe, *Diplomatarium Anglicum Aevi Saxonici* (London, 1865), p. 481.

¹⁰ B. Thorpe, *op. cit.*, p. 596; cf. also p. 470 and p. 556.

¹¹ Alfred's translation of Orosius' *History of the World*; ed. J. Bosworth (London, 1859), p. 20.

¹² Harrison's *Description of England*, ed. F. Furnivall (London, 1877), I, p. 339.

the man in charge of the pasturing of swine.¹³ The *Rectitudines Singularum Personarum*, dated ca. 1025, also indicate organization within the rank of swineherd, as they mention three classes: *æhteswan*, *gafolswan*, *inswan*.¹⁴ When oaks did not provide a good yield of mast it was a serious matter; the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records that 1116 was a hard year and very barren in mast. This concern about the supply of mast is shown even more definitely by the fact that the Domesday Survey evaluates woodlots in terms of the number of swine for which they can produce mast; entries occur such as "woodland is there to feed 40 swine," "woodland to feed 500 swine," "woodland for 730 swine," "woodland to feed 1000 swine."¹⁵ Also in the Domesday Survey woodlots were evaluated according to the number of swine which a lord could claim for his permission to pasture the herd in his woodlot; such entries occur as "woodland to render 90 swine," "woodland to render 200 swine."¹⁶ From such facts about swine and mast it appears that an activity contributing to the supplying of swine with mast would have been one associated with a matter of importance in Anglo-Saxon daily life. Evidence for such an activity involving the climbing of trees is found in literature, illuminations, sculpture, and woodcuts; some pertains directly to Anglo-Saxon England, some to England of later dates and to other European countries.

For convenience the following pieces of evidence from literature are set down in roughly chronological order. (1) Probably the earliest reference to a man in a tree on English soil is found in the anonymous *Vita S. Cuthberti*, written at the beginning of the eighth century; here one of the miracles of Cuthbert concerns a herdsman Hadwald who had fallen from the top of a tree and had been killed.¹⁷ (2) Bede's prose version of the *Vita*

¹³ B. Thorpe, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-1.

¹⁴ F. Liebermann, *op. cit.*, I, 447, sect. 4, 2; 448, sect. 6; 449, sect. 7.

¹⁵ Cf. *Victoria History of the County of Hertford*, I, pp. 302-44; IV, p. 275; *Victoria History of the County of Norfolk*, II, pp. 40 ff. In the laws of Ine a tree is evaluated in terms of the number of swine that can be pastured under it; cf. F. Liebermann, *op. cit.*, II, 2, 580 under *Mast*.

¹⁶ Cf. *Victoria History of the County of Berkshire*, I, pp. 324-68; II, p. 341.

¹⁷ *Postremo tamen diligenter inquirentes, unum ex fratribus eorum in*

adds here only the information that the herdsman was a man of good life and that he had been climbing the tree too incautiously.¹⁸ (3) Bede's metrical version of the *Vita* expands the account somewhat in narrating that the herdsman had been climbing the high places of a leafy grove in order to beat down food for his livestock from the leafy top.¹⁹ (4) The Old English poem *Fortunes of Men* lists many mishaps to which men are subject, and among these is the mishap that one shall fall featherless from a high tree in the wood; the poem adds that such a one is however in flight, swings about in the air until there is no longer any fruit on the tree, then falls to the roots and perishes.²⁰ In this account the fruit is specifically that of a forest tree, quite possibly nuts or acorns;²¹ the mention of swinging about in the air until there is no longer any fruit on the tree is, I suggest, a reference to one who is clinging to boughs which he is shaking or beating for acorns; when none remains, that is, perhaps, when by a last effort he reaches the farthest ones, he loses his balance and falls. (5) Bede's account of Hadwald's fall is elaborated somewhat by Aelfric; he states concerning Hadwald that the herdsman, in the faithful discharge of his duty, climbed an oak and fed his livestock with the leafy top, and he fell hard, and

pastoralibus habitaculis de summo cacumine ligni deorsum cadentem fracto corpore exanimem audierunt; Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert, ed. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1940), p. 126.

¹⁸ . . . quidam de pastoribus bonae actionis vir incautius in arborem ascendens deciderat deorsum; Colgrave, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

¹⁹ *Frondiferi quendam nemoris dum scanderet alta/ Caederet ut pecori arboreo de pabula cono/ Deciduum membris animam posuisse solutis; Bedas metrische Vita S. Cuthberti*, ed. W. Jaager, *Palaestra*, 198, p. 110.

²⁰ *The Fortunes of Men*, ed. Krapp and Dobbie in *The Exeter Book* (N. Y., 1936), vv. 21-24: *Sum sceal on holte of hean beame/ fiberleas feallan; bið on flithe seþeah/ laceð on lyfte oppæt lengre ne bið/ westem wudubeames. bonne he on wyrtruman/ sigeð sworcenferð sawle bireafod*. Liebermann, *op. cit.*, II, 2 under *Baum* takes this passage as evidence of the frequency of fatal accidents in the felling of trees; but the mention of the fruit of the tree makes such an interpretation hardly plausible.

²¹ The word *westem*, which I have translated as "fruit" is used synonymously with *oþet* (*Genesis* 462) and the modern English dialectal derivative of *oþet* means "the mast and acorns of the oak"; cf. *ovet* in *N. E. D.*

died, with glory to God for the fidelity of his care as herdsman.²² Here it is with leafy top that the herdsman feeds his stock; but it is likely that the words "with the leafy top," *mid treowenum helme*, are a rendering of Bede's *arboreo de cono*,²³ which locution states the place from which Hadwald was to beat food for his stock, not the material with which he was to feed them. (6) The thirteenth century writer Bartholomeus Anglicus states that November is the month for fattening swine and that therefore November is depicted as a rustic beating the oaks and feeding his swine with acorns.²⁴ (7) The fourteenth century poem *Seven Sages of Rome* contains a passage which suggests that swineherds were accustomed to climb oaks:

Hyt was a swynherde yn þys cuntré
 And kept swyne grete plente.
 So on a day he fayled a boor,
 And began to morne and syke sore;
 He durste not go home to hys mete
 For drede hys maystyrス wolde him bete.
 He clambe hye upon a tree
 And akorns for hunger ete he.²⁵

In another version he climbs into a haw tree and casts down haws for a wild boar; then climbing down bough by bough, he hangs by his left hand and strokes the boar—an indication of some agility.²⁶ (8) In sixteenth century husbandry November was the proper month for beating down food for swine; such advice is given by Thomas Tusser: "get pole, boy mine, beate hawes to swine."²⁷ (9) I hope that it is not belaboring a point

²² *Homilies of Aelfric*, ed. B. Thorpe (London, 1845), II, p. 150: *pæt hire hyrdeman ӯurh holdrædene ða sume ac astah and his orf læswode mid treowenum helme and he hearde feoll, gewat of worulde, mid wuldre to Gode for ӯære hylde his hirdrædene.*

²³ Cf. note 19 *supra*.

²⁴ *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, IX, XVIII: *Et ideo tunc temporis animalia maxime porci multum impinguantur propter quod depingitur quasi rusticus quercus percutiens et glandibus reficiens porcos suos.* I have used an undated copy in the Stanford Library. The *N. E. D.*, under *acorn*, cites Trevisa's translation of this passage: November is paynted as a chorle betyng okes and fedyng his swyne with maste and hockornes.

²⁵ *The Seven Sages of Rome*, ed. K. Campbell (N. Y., 1907), p. 159.

²⁶ K. Campbell, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

²⁷ Tusser's *Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry*, ed. W. Payne and S. Herrtage (London, 1878; English Dialect Society, Vol. XV), p. 55.

to suggest that in the following passage from Spenser there is indirectly an indication that the climbing of oaks was a recognized practical activity:

How often have I scaled the craggie oke
 All to dislodge the raven of her nest!
 Howe have I wearied with many a stroke
 The stately walnut tree, the while the rest
 Under the tree fell all for nuts at strife.²⁸

These lines concern the light activities of youth; since "all to" here means "just to," this climbing merely to dislodge the raven is contrasted with climbing done for a more utilitarian purpose, perhaps the beating of acorns, since this in turn contrasts with the sport of beating the walnut tree for nuts. (10) There is a bit of evidence that in the seventeenth century the shaking down of mast for swine was an act widely observed, for reference to such an act is made as elucidation in a simile: "Like Hogs eating up the Maske, not looking up to the hand that shaketh it downe."²⁹ (11) In William Gilpin's *Forest Scenery*, published in 1794, there is a description of the mast season in New Forest, Hampshire; no beating of oaks is mentioned, but one is led to believe that it must have occurred: "and as evening draws on, the swineherd gives them another plentiful repast under the neighbouring trees, which rain acorns upon them for an hour together, at the sound of his horn. . . . Now and then, in calm weather when mast falls sparingly, he calls them perhaps together by the music of his horn to a gratuitous meal. . . ."³⁰ It seems dubious that oaks could at a given time rain acorns for an hour without some inducement from the hand of man; the mention of raining acorns is reminiscent of Dryden's line: "Nor shaken oaks such showers of acorns rain."³¹ (12) James Fowler, writing in *Archeologia* in 1873, states that acorns are still knocked down for pigs in Sussex lanes;³² and that oaks were climbed at this time for acorns is indicated by a citation in the *English Dialect*

²⁸ *The Shephearde's Calender*, December, vv. 31-35.

²⁹ Cited in *N. E. D.* under *mast*, from Fuller, *Joseph's Coat* 147.

³⁰ W. Gilpin, *Remarks on Forest Scenery* (London, 1794), II, pp. 114-15.

³¹ *Georgics*, 4, 119.

³² James Fowler, "On Medieval Representations of the Months and Seasons," *Archeologia*, XLIV, p. 206.

Dictionary under *climb*: "'E clomb up the wuktree after the ackerns."

While no one of these passages states inclusively that a swineherd climbed an oak to beat down acorns for swine, compositely they make such an activity highly likely. They indicate that throughout a long period of English life men have beaten trees to provide food for livestock, and that in this task the tree was sometimes climbed.

Illuminations corroborate what the written passages indicate. The eleventh century MS Cotton Julius A. VI contains an illumination showing two swineherds driving swine beneath oaks; one of the swineherds is shaking a branch.³³ A cut of a quite similar illumination is given by Wright in his *History of Domestic Manners and Sentiments in England*; it represents, he states, swineherds driving their swine to the woods to feed on acorns, which one of the swineherds is shaking from a tree with his hand.³⁴ Illuminations in thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth century manuscripts frequently depict the labor for October or November as a swineherd beating acorns from an oak, with swine beneath the tree. For example, in James' catalogues of manuscripts at Cambridge are such descriptions of illuminations as the following from Trinity College MS B. 11. 4, of English provenience: Man with raised stick under an oak, three pigs, one looks up; from Trinity College MS B. 11. 31, of French provenience: beats huge acorns off oak tree for two pigs on right; from Corpus Christi College MS 53, of English provenience: beats oak for a pig; from Clare College MS Kk. 3. 2, of French provenience: beating oaks, gold pigs below. In the catalogue of MSS in the Hunterian Museum at Glasgow an illumination from MS 229 is described as follows: a swineherd muffled in a slate-colored cloak with red and white border, beating down acorns with a forked stick for three brown pigs from a quite conventional tree.³⁵ An illumination from the Psalter of Queen Isabella of England is described as showing a hooded man

³³ For reproduction of a photograph of this, see J. Webster, *The Labors of the Months* (Northwestern University, 1938), plate XVIII.

³⁴ T. Wright, *A History of Domestic Manners and Sentiments in England* (London, 1862), p. 70.

³⁵ P. Aitken, *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of the Hunterian Museum in the University of Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1908), p. 172.

with a club beating an oak, and swine feeding on the acorns.³⁶ Some reproductions of such illuminations are accessible; for example, plate 143 in the reproductions from Queen Mary's Psalter shows two men beating with clubs at acorns on oaks, and pigs feeding.³⁷

Most of the pertinent illuminations which I have seen or have read about show the swineherd on the ground; some show him in the tree. From Trinity College Cambridge MS B. 11. 22, of Flemish provenience, an illumination is described in James' catalogue as follows: Tree. In the branches a man with a club. On a ladder another with acorns in his lap. And a third with his lap full; below, hogs feeding on the acorns.³⁸ In Webster's *Labors of the Months*, among reproductions of illuminations from the Cremona *Martyrology of Adone*, the labor for October shows a man with a club climbing an oak tree, with one leg over the lowest bough, and pigs feeding on fallen acorns.³⁹ The Luttrell Psalter, written and illuminated in East Anglia about 1340, is famous for its illuminations depicting scenes of English medieval life; it contains such scenes as plowing, harrowing, reaping, feeding chickens. The margin of folio 59b is occupied by a full-length illumination showing a man high up in an oak tree, beating at a cluster of acorns with a club, one pig feeding on fallen acorns and another looking eagerly up with his front feet on the trunk of the tree.⁴⁰

³⁶ D. Egbert, "A Sister to the Tickhill Psalter," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, XXXIX, p. 774. For descriptions of similar illuminations cf. no. 252 in James' *Catalogue of MSS. at St. Johns College Cambridge*, no. 98 in James' *Catalogue of MSS. in the Fitzwilliam Museum*, and nos. 40, 43, and 62 in C. Borland, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Medieval Manuscripts in Edinburgh University Library* (Edinburgh, 1916).

³⁷ Queen Mary's Psalter, *Miniatures and Drawings by an English Artist of the 14th Century*, reproduced from Royal MS. 2 B. VII in the British Museum, with an introduction by Sir George Warner (London, 1912). For reproductions of similar illuminations cf. D. Hartley and M. Elliot, *Life and Work of the People of England* (London, 1931), vol. I, pp. 43 and 55.

³⁸ M. James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1900), I, p. 368.

³⁹ J. Webster, *op. cit.*, plate XXIV.

⁴⁰ The Luttrell Psalter, *Two Plates in Colour and One Hundred and*

The labors for the months are depicted in medieval sculpture, the labor for October or November frequently being represented as a swineherd beating oaks; in pictures which I have seen of these sculptures, the swineherd is on the ground. For example, in woodcarvings at Abington Hall, Northamptonshire, a man strikes with a large club at acorns on a tree for three greedy pigs;⁴¹ on a baptismal font at Brookland, Kent, a swineherd beats with a club, but no tree is shown;⁴² a relief on the porch of the church of San Zeno at Verona shows a large-faced man beating at acorns on a tree for two pigs.⁴³ Descriptions of such carvings are likely to be tersely confined to the expression "beating oaks";⁴⁴ at least one is more detailed: "On misericords at Lincoln and Worcester the pigs can be seen feeding under the trees, while the swineherd wrestles with the branches."⁴⁵

The labor of beating acorns for swine is also depicted in woodcuts. One, in the Cologne edition of Bede, is described by Fowler as showing men knocking down acorns from oaks with staves, and swine feeding below.⁴⁶ Another shows a man with a club in his right hand beating a tree for acorns; he is looking upward, holding on to a limb with his left hand while his right foot is braced on the lower part of the trunk. Though not quite up in the tree, he is obviously headed in that direction.⁴⁷

As depicted in the Cotton MS already referred to, acorns could be shaken down by merely grasping a branch from the ground; as depicted in numerous illuminations, some could be reached from the ground with a club; respectively as referred to by Tusser and as depicted in the St. Johns College MS 252 and the Trinity College MS B. 11. 22, some could be reached with a pole, knocked

Eighty-Three in Monochrome from the Additional Manuscript 42130 in the British Museum, with an introduction by E. G. Millar (London, 1932), plate 14.

⁴¹ A picture of this is given on p. 328 of H. Davis' edition of Barnard's *Companion to English History* (Oxford, 1924).

⁴² J. Webster, *op. cit.*, plate LVI.

⁴³ J. Webster, *op. cit.*, plate XXXIV; for pictures of similar carvings cf. plates XLVII and LII.

⁴⁴ Note the descriptions given by J. Fowler, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

⁴⁵ M. Anderson, *The Medieval Carver* (Cambridge, 1935), p. 43.

⁴⁶ J. Fowler, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

⁴⁷ M. Schretlen, *Dutch and Flemish Woodcuts of the Fifteenth Century* (N. Y., 1925), plate 29.

down by a hurled club, or reached by the use of a ladder. The fulfillment of such tasks required no particular gift. In the material adduced as corroborative evidence in the present interpretation of the passage in *Christ*, there is noticeable, when the act of climbing a tree is unmistakably depicted or referred to, an emphasis upon the height and the top of the tree. Hadwald was climbing the high places of a grove (*nemoris alta*), he fell from the very top (*de summo cacumine*); a man might meet death by a fall from a high tree (*of hean beame*); the swineherd who dared not go home climbed *hye upon a tree*; the swineherd pictured in the Luttrell Psalter is beating at acorns from a perch on almost the highest branch. One can readily believe that the beating of the highest acorns was a labor accompanied by some danger and accomplished successfully only by one skilled in climbing. Yet there was good reason to obtain this more inaccessible mast; since in early English times mast-bearing woodlots were evaluated in terms of the number of swine for which the trees could provide mast, it must have behooved an owner of these trees to see to it that even the topmost branches were stripped of acorns when in November the time for the fattening of swine was at hand.

In the interpretation of the passage in *Christ*, along with indecision about a specific task to which tree climbing might apply, there has been doubt about the dignity of such activity.⁴⁸ It is pertinent to note that the beating of oaks was not without an element of dignity. Of Hadwald, who we know climbed an oak to provide food for his stock, Aelfric wrote that he had climbed it in the performance of his duty and that he fell and departed from this world with glory to God for fidelity in the care of his herd. The figures of swineherds beating oaks adorned baptismal fonts and church portals. Two illuminations showing the swineherd in the tree belong to a series of seasonal labors which include hawking, hunting, threshing, mowing, killing hogs, and tilling the soil, none of which is represented as more dignified than another. The swineherd was not always lowly; he is known to have urged his rights before King Beornwulf of Mercia; he is pictured in the eleventh century MS Cotton Julius A. VI as a dignified-appearing man, well attired; in the early thirteenth

⁴⁸ Cf. Krapp and Dobbie, *The Exeter Book*, p. 253, note to *Christ* 679.

century a swineherd contributed so munificently to the work of Lincoln Minster that his figure was placed on the north turret, in which dignified station he long held his swineherd's horn aloft.⁴⁹

The main problem in the interpretation of the passage in *Christ* has been the determination of a specific and widely recognized accomplishment to which the reference to tree climbing could fittingly apply and which certain men were recognizedly able to utilize. Such an accomplishment was the climbing of high oaks in order to beat down acorns for swine, a matter calling for no mean ability and performed as a more difficult part of a well-known task by certain swineherds in faithful fulfillment of their duty.

HERBERT MERITT.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

⁴⁹ Cf. J. Fowler, *op. cit.*, pp. 206-7.

NOTES ON TACITUS.

These notes, which have been selected from a vastly larger collection, are intended as a contribution to knowledge of Tacitus' style and as a warning against much reliance on his commentators. The smaller-scale commentaries on the historical works by Nipperdey and Andresen and Carl and Wilhelm Heraeus contain many errors; but they show a much less defective knowledge of Latin than the larger works by Furneaux and Goelzer.

Many words and expressions which are peculiar to Tacitus are not so described in the commentaries. On the other hand many words and expressions are wrongly said to be peculiar to him. For example:

Ann., I, 61, 1: *incedunt maestos locos*. Furneaux says that *incedo* has an accusative of place only here and in XIV, 15, 3 and 22, 4. It has such an accusative in Apuleius, *Met.*, VIII, 28 and in later writers.

II, 6, 2: *angusta puppi proraque et lato utero*. Draeger, W. Heraeus, Jacob, and Furneaux all say that there is no other example of *uterus* in the sense of *alveus*, which Tacitus uses in 23, 4 but avoids here probably because of *per ora et alveos fluminum* four lines above and *Rhenus uno alveo continuus* nine lines below. But cf. Paulinus of Nola, *Carm.*, XXIV, 175: *in nauis utero*.

24, 1: *tantum illa clades nouitate et magnitudine excessit*. Jacob says that this is the only example of *excedere* used absolutely in the sense of *praestare*. But cf. Pliny, *N. H.*, XIX, 65 and XXXVII, 139.

33, 3: *dignationibus antistent*. Draeger and Furneaux say that *dignatio* occurs nowhere else in the plural. It occurs in many places, one of which is Quintilian, XI, 1, 67.

36, 3: *quinquiplicari*. Draeger, Jacob, and Furneaux say that this word is not found elsewhere. It is found in Jerome, *In Iob.*, 1.

73, 1: *erant qui formam aetatem genus mortis . . . magni Alexandri fatis adaequarent*. Draeger, Jacob, and Furneaux say that *adaequare* appears not to be used like this elsewhere. It is so used by Tertullian and other writers later than Tacitus, and cf. Silius, XII, 278-9: *Martis adaequant Marcellum decori*.

III, 1, 3: *classis paulatim succedit*. Furneaux says *succedere* is "not apparently elsewhere used in this sense absolutely." Cf. Sallust, *Iug.*, 57, 4.

16, 1: *nostram ad iuuentam durauerunt*. Furneaux says that *duro* in the sense of "live on" appears to be peculiar to Tacitus. The word is so used by Plautus, Columella, the elder Pliny, Statius, Quintilian, Juvenal, and others.

25, 1: *educationes liberum*. Furneaux says in his second edition, but not in his first, that the plural of *educatio* is found only in Tacitus. Cf. Apuleius, *De Mundo*, 29; Julius Valerius, II, 4; and Macrobius, *Sat.*, I, 7, 25.

33, 1: *concordem sibi*. Although Nipperdey had cited Seneca, *De Breu. Vit.*, 8, 5, Furneaux says that *concors* is not found elsewhere with a dative. Cf. Seneca, *Ep.*, LXXXIX, 15; Apuleius, *De Plat.*, II, 5; and Ammianus Marcellinus, XVII, 13, 1.

IV, 12, 4: *inliciebantur*. Furneaux says here and in Vol. I, p. 55 that only Tacitus uses *inlicere* with an infinitive. There are examples in Ammianus Marcellinus, XVI, 10, 18; XXIX, 5, 49; Claudian, *De Cons. Stil.*, II, 41-2; and in Augustine and Jerome.

23, 2: *in maius audiebantur*. Furneaux says that *in maius audiri* seems to occur nowhere else. Cf. Sallust, *Hist.*, frag. II, 69.

45, 2: *proripuit se custodibus*. Draeger and Furneaux are of the belief that only here has *proripere* this construction. Cf. Valerius Flaccus, V, 268.

VI, 29, 4: *quae incitamentum mortis et particeps fuit*. Furneaux says that *incitamentum* is used of persons only here and in *Hist.*, II, 23, 5. Cf. Curtius, III, 11, 7.

32, 4: *adulatorii*. Furneaux says this word seems to occur nowhere else. Cf., for example, Servius, commentary on Virgil, *Aen.*, III, 338; Augustine, *Ep.*, CIV, 3, 11 and CCXXXII, 2.

XII, 9, 1: *Mammium Pollionem ingentibus promissis inducunt sententiam expromere*. Furneaux says that the simple infinitive occurs nowhere else with *induco* by itself without *animum*. There is an example in Lucretius, I, 142 in a passage which I should have thought was unforgettable.

27, 1: *ueteranos coloniamque deduci impetrat*. Jacob calls the construction unique. Cf., for instance, Ammianus Marcellinus, XIV, 1, 3.

57, 2: *cupidinis ac praedarum*. Furneaux says that *cupido* means "covetousness" apparently only in Tacitus, as though he had never read Horace.

63, 1: *artissimo inter Europam Asiamque diuortio*. Furneaux says that Draeger notes that *diuortium* is nowhere else used precisely in this sense. Cf. Schol. Juvenal, X, 1, *angustissimo diuortio inter columnas Herculis*.

XIII, 35, 3: *adnotatusque miles . . . praeriguisse manus*. Furneaux says that *adnoto* does not occur elsewhere with this construction. Cf. Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.*, I, 46, 5.

XIV, 4, 1: *iuta*. Furneaux says that this participle is found only in Tacitus. Cf. Palladius, IV, 10, 36.

29, 2: *concertator*. Jacob, Furneaux, Becher, Nipperdey, and Andresen all say that this word occurs nowhere else. Cf. Augustine, *Serm.*, 297, 4, 6; *Contra Acad.*, III, 20, 44; and Cassiodorus, *Hist.*, I, 14.

XV, 12, 1: *commeatibus non egenum*. Draeger and Becher say that this is the only example of *egenus* with an ablative. Cf. *Ann.*, XII, 46, 1 and Augustine, *Serm.*, 75, 4, to say nothing of other writers.

XVI, 19, 2: *alios . . . quosdam*. Furneaux quotes without disapproval Draeger's assertion that this co-ordination is found nowhere else. Some examples earlier than Tacitus are to be seen in Curtius, III, 3, 4; V, 5, 6; Seneca, *De Clem.*, I, 17, 2; Quintilian, IV, 3, 16.

Hist., I, 26, 2: *quaedam apud Galbae aures praefectus Laco elusit*. G. A. Davies says of *apud aures* "this expression . . . seems to be peculiar to Tacitus," and Gudeman on *Agric.*, 44, 5, *apud nostras aures*, describes the phrase as "an instance of metonymy . . . which occurs in four other Tacitean passages . . . but not elsewhere." It is not even new in Tacitus, as Gudeman might have learned from Wolff on this passage of the *Histories*, for he cites Curtius, VI, 11, 15. For other examples see Valerius Maximus, VII, 2, ext. 11; Fronto, 168, 21 N., Apuleius, *Flor.*, 18, p. 38, 14 H.; Ammianus Marcellinus, XVIII, 4, 4; XXII, 11, 5; XXVIII, 6, 26; XXX, 1, 17; Jerome, *Ep.*, LVII, 1; Sidonius, *Ep.*, VII, 7, 4.

39, 2: *agitasse . . . de occidendo*. Spooner says that the construction seems peculiar to Tacitus. It is found with *agito* in this sense at least as early as Livy, IV, 13, 4.

II, 8, 1: *militum . . . ex Oriente commeantium*. Wolff, W. Heraeus, and Goelzer say that *commeare* is found only here with this particular meaning. But cf. Donatus on Terence, *Hecyra*, 175.

44, 3: *si ita ferret*. Wolff and Goelzer say that this expression occurs only in Tacitus. Cf. Seneca, *N. Q.*, VI, 32, 12.

IV, 39, 3: *haud defutura consciorum manu, ni Scribonianus abnuisset*. Spooner says "this use of the ablative absolute with the future participle to express a result sure or likely to happen on a certain contingency, is peculiar to Tacitus." Cf. Livy, IV, 18, 6 and Pliny, *N. H.*, XIX, 189, to say nothing of later writers.

65, 2: *deductis olim et nobiscum per conubium sociatis quique mox prouenerunt*. W. Heraeus and Andresen both say that *prouenire* is not so used elsewhere. Cf. Justin, II, 10, 4 and XLIV, 4, 2.

Agric., 10, 2: *Britannia . . . in occidentem Hispaniae obtenditur*. Furneaux and J. G. C. Anderson say that *obtenditur* in this geographical sense seems to be peculiar to Tacitus; and Gudeman on p. 337 of his edition published in 1928 includes the word among what he calls in one breath ἄπαξ εἰρημένα and in the next "words either first found in Tacitus or used by him in new meanings." Cf. Mela, I, 20; II, 23; Pliny, *N. H.*, V, 77; Solinus, 10, 23.

35, 2: *equitum tria milia cornibus affunderentur*. Anderson follows Furneaux in saying that the verb is apparently used only here in this sense; and Gudeman includes it in his list on p. 337. cf. Seneca, *N. Q.*, I, praef. 10.

Many words and expressions which are new in Tacitus are not so described in the commentaries. On the other hand many words and expressions are wrongly said to occur first in him. For example:—

Ann., I, 22, 1: *turbatos et quid pararet intentos*. Furneaux says in his first edition, concerning the last three words, "no other instance is noted of such a construction"; in his second edition he becomes emphatic and calls the construction "unprecedented." He is mistaken: cf. Livy, V, 45, 1.

46, 1: *dissideat . . . miles*. W. Heraeus repeats Draeger's statement that *dissidere* thus used in the sense of "sich empören" is new. Cf. Frontinus, *Strat.*, II, 5, 18.

II, 5, 1: *ut ea specie Germanicum suetis legionibus abstra-*

heret. W. Heraeus repeats Draeger's remark "abstrahere mit dem Dativ . . . ; bei Früheren nur mit Präpositionen." Cf. Ovid, *Met.*, XIII, 658; Seneca, *Med.*, 144-5; Lucan, VI, 80.

11, 1: *nisi pontibus praesidiisque impositis dare in discrimen legiones haud imperatorium ratus.* Furneaux quotes without disapproval Draeger's assertion that the substantival use of *imperatorium* meaning "good generalship" is a novelty. Cf. Seneca, *De Clem.*, I, 26, 4.

77, 3: *inauditum et indefensum.* Furneaux, like Jacob on IV, 11, 1, says that *inauditum* is not found in this sense before Tacitus; on *Dial.*, 16, 4 Gudeman says that it does not occur before Tacitus "in der hier geforderten juristischen Bedeutung"; and at *Ann.*, XII, 22, 2 Furneaux speaks of this "Tacitean sense of the word." Cf. Seneca, *Contr.*, exc. X, 6 and Seneca, *Medea*, 199. The word is so used also in Pliny, *Ep.*, IV, 11, 6 and in many later writers.

III, 10, 2: *spernendis rumoribus ualidum.* W. Heraeus repeats Draeger's statement on 60, 1 that *uvalidus* with the dative of a gerundive "findet sich erst in den Annalen." Cf. Livy, XXV, 36, 9: *uix feminis puerisue morandis satis ualidum.*

IV, 46, 2: *antequam arma inciperent.* W. Heraeus repeats Draeger's statement that *arma incipere* "ist neu gebildete Phrase." Cf. Statius, *Theb.*, X, 690.

VI, 35, 2: *instantius.* Furneaux, Vol. I, p. 43, says that Tacitus appears to have added this comparative form to those in Cicero and Livy. Cf. Quintilian, IX, 3, 50 and Pliny, *Ep.*, VI, 20, 10.

XI, 24, 4: *aduena in nos regnauerunt.* Draeger and Becher say "regnare in aliquem findet sich auch Lact. epit. 13, 14," and Furneaux says "regnare in is noted as a novel phrase." Cf. Manilius, IV, 239.

29, 1: *flagrantissima.* Furneaux, Vol. I, p. 43, says that Tacitus appears to have added the superlative *flagrantissimus* to those found in Cicero and Livy; and Goelzer on *Hist.*, II, 31, 1 calls it "nouveau et rare." It is to be found in Cicero, *De Fato*, 3 and Livy, XLIV, 36, 7 as well as in Valerius Maximus and the elder and younger Pliny. There are at least eight examples before Tacitus and as many after him.

XIV, 22, 1: *sidus cometes effulsit de quo uulgi opinio est tamquam mutationem regis portendat.* Furneaux quotes with-

out disapproval Draeger's statement that the construction with *tamquam* is a novelty. Cf. Seneca, *N. Q.*, II, 32, 2.

XV, 59, 2: *arma . . . cieret*. Furneaux calls this a new expression. Cf. Statius, *Theb.*, VIII, 385.

Hist., I, 30, 1: *relatu uirtutum*. Valmaggi, Spooner, Davies, Goelzer, and Furneaux, Vol. I, p. 64, all suppose that *relatus* is new. Cf. Seneca, *N. Q.*, VII, 16, 1.

72, 2: *quippe tot interfectis*. Spooner says that *quippe* does not occur in earlier writers with an ablative absolute. It is so used as early as Livy; see, for example, III, 63, 2.

III, 53, 1: *se Pannonicas legiones in arma egisse*. Goelzer refers to *in arma egisse* as an "expression nouvelle pour ad bellum impulisse." Cf. Livy, VI, 15, 7; XXX, 14, 10; Lucan, II, 254; and Statius, *Theb.*, V, 676-7.

IV, 20, 2: *fortunam proelii experiretur*. Goelzer remarks on "la nouveauté du tour *fortunam praelii* [so he writes] *experiri*, au lieu de l'expression ordinaire *fortunam belli temptare*." There is nothing novel in *experiri*. Cf. Cicero, *Tusc.*, V, 61; Sallust, *Iug.*, 63, 1; Livy, VII, 37, 4; and Caesar, *B. G.*, II, 16, 3: *ut eandem belli fortunam experirentur* and *B. C.*, II, 30, 2: *belli fortunam experiri*.

53, 2: *serena luce*. W. Heraeus repeats his father's words "gesuchte Neuerung für sereno caelo." Cf. Virgil, *Aen.*, V, 104-5.

Many words and expressions in Tacitus which are new to prose are not so described in the commentaries. On the other hand there are many words and expressions in him which it is wrongly said or implied do not occur in earlier prose.¹ For example:

Ann., I, 15, 2: *de nomine Augusti*. Furneaux calls the phrase poetical and refers to Lucretius and Virgil. Cf. Sallust, *Hist.*, frag. II, 87, D.

20, 1: *dereptum uehiculo*. Furneaux says the construction of the verb with a dative and the construction of it with an ablative are both poetical; and Andresen repeats Nipperdey's statement

¹ A fault which is especially conspicuous in Goelzer's commentary is the indiscriminate labelling as poetical of words which are not found in earlier extant prose, of words which are used in earlier Silver Latin prose, and of words which are used in prose as early as, or even earlier than, Livy, who had been dead for about a century when the *Histories* and the *Annals* were written.

that they are "nach dem Vorgange der Dichter." Cf. Cicero, *Pro Quinctio*, 64; *De Off.*, III, 42; Valerius Maximus, III, 2, ext. 4; III, 3, ext. 2; III, 7, ext. 6; Pliny, *N. H.*, VIII, 83; X, 12.

32, 3: *ardescerent*. W. Heraeus repeats Draeger's remark "früher nur bei Dichtern." See, for instance, Seneca, *Contr.*, VII, praef. 5 and Pliny, *N. H.*, VIII, 181.

61, 1: *maestos locos*. W. Heraeus repeats Draeger's statement that *maestus* with reference to a thing is previously poetical. Cf., for instance, Livy, III, 6, 5: *maestum . . . responsum*.

64, 3: *indefessi*. Furneaux says here and on XVI, 22, 1, with which notes compare what he says in Vol. I, p. 64, that Tacitus first introduced this word into prose. Cf. Pliny, *Pan.*, 14, 5. *Inopinus*, which Tacitus uses a little further on in 68, 4, occurs in Pliny, *Pan.*, 30, 2.

65, 1: *laeto cantu aut truci sonore subiecta uallium ac resultantis saltus complerent*. Nipperdey and Andresen say that *sonor* is a poetical word used by Lucretius and Virgil; on XIV, 36, 1 Draeger and Becher say that it is "sonst dichterisch," and Furneaux (cf. Vol. I, p. 65) says it is introduced into prose by Tacitus and is found afterwards in Apuleius. It is found in other later writers than Apuleius, and it is used in prose as early as Sallust, *Hist.*, frag. II, 87, D and III, 96, C10. Furneaux also describes *resulto* as poetical. It occurs in Pliny, *Pan.*, 73, 1 in the same sense as here.

73, 3: *notuere*. Furneaux says that *notesco* is one of those verbs found in no earlier prose; and W. Heraeus repeats here and at IV, 7, 1 Draeger's statement to the same effect. Cf. Seneca, *De Ben.*, III, 32, 2 and *N. Q.*, VII, 25, 3.

75, 2: *erogandae per honesta pecuniae cupiens*. Furneaux says that the genitive with *cupiens* "seems to be an instance in which he has gone back to a Plautine usage." Cf. Terence, *Hecyra*, 142 and Sallust, *Hist.*, frag. V, 19.

II, 55, 5: *ut sermone uulgi parens legionum haberetur*. Nipperdey quotes for *haberetur* Virgil, *Aen.*, XII, 134. Cf. Sallust, *Hist.*, frag. II, 5.

61, 1: *instar montium eductae pyramides*. Furneaux says that this use of *educere* is Virgilian, and at Vol. I, p. 65 he says that the use is hitherto exclusively poetical. Cf. Vitruvius, II, 1, 4; VI, 3, 8; Seneca, *Ep.*, LXXXIX, 21; XCIV, 61 and *Ad Polyb.*, 18, 2.

75, 1: *feralis reliquias*. W. Heraeus repeats Draeger's remark "feralis . . . bei Dichtern und Späteren." Cf. Seneca, *Contr.*, IX, 2, 27; exc. X, 4, p. 513, 21 M., Pliny, *N. H.*, X, 35; XVI, 40; XVIII, 237.

82, 3: *silentia*. Furneaux says that this plural is elsewhere wholly confined to poets, when in fact it is used by at least a dozen prose writers of whom the earliest is the elder Pliny.

III, 9, 2: *nauem tumulo Caesaram adpulerat*. Furneaux says the dative is Virgilian. Cf. Livy, XXV, 26, 4; XXVIII, 36, 10; XXX, 10, 3; Valerius Maximus, II, 10, ext. 1; IX, 8, 3, ext. 1; Curtius, IV, 2, 24 and IV, 3, 18.

62, 1: *inuiolabile*. Furneaux, Vol. I, p. 65, says that this word appears not to be used in prose before Tacitus. Cf., for instance, Seneca, *Ep.*, LVIII, 18 and *De Ben.*, V, 5, 1.

IV, 16, 3: *demutari*. Furneaux says *demuto* is "apparently one of the words revived by Tacitus from Plautus." Cf. Cato, *Or.*, frag. XXVI, 125 Malcovati.

29, 2: *exsequi accusationem adigitur*. W. Heraeus repeats Draeger's statement that *adigere* with an infinitive is poetical except in Tacitus. It is used frequently by Ammianus Marcellinus and occurs in other prose writers after Tacitus. Before Tacitus it is found in Seneca, *De Ira*, II, 36, 6.

69, 2: *quorum adfatum copia*. Furneaux says that *adfatim* is used as an adjective in Plautus, *Trin.*, 1185. Cf. Cicero, *Ad Att.*, XVI, 1, 5.

VI, 2, 3: *principem orabat diligere senatores*. W. Heraeus says that *orare* is used with a plain infinitive in Plautus and Virgil. J. B. Hofmann in the revision of Stolz-Schmalz's *Lateinische Grammatik*, p. 581 says it is so used first in Virgil in verse and in Tacitus in prose. Cf. *Bellum Hisp.*, 13, 5.

XI, 1, 2: *didita per prouincias fama*. Furneaux says that the expression is taken from Virgil, *Aen.*, VIII, 132; cf. also Silius, I, 186. He also says in Vol. I, p. 64 that *didere* is apparently not in prose before Tacitus. Cf. Cato, *Or.*, frag. XLI, 171 Malcovati.

XII, 32, 2: *arma coeptabant . . . bellum exercebat*. Jacob says "arma coeptabant, expression poétique, mais fréquente dans Tacite." I know of no other example of the phrase in Tacitus and I have not found it elsewhere. Of *bellum exercebat* Jacob says "expression empruntée aux poëtes." It is true that it is used in Silius, XIII, 740-1, but cf. Seneca, *De Breu. Vit.*, 7, 1.

45, 3: *Pharasmanem bello absterruisset*. Furneaux says in his first edition "with simple abl., as in Hor. S. 2. 5, 83." In his second edition the note runs "with simple abl., as in Hor. S. 1, 5, 129." Neither of these references is correct, and cf. Pliny, *N. H.*, VIII, 47.

XIV, 35, 2: *impollutam*. Furneaux says that this word occurs outside Tacitus apparently only in Silius, XIII, 679. It occurs in Sallust, *Hist.*, frag. I, 55, 11 and in many later writers.

46, 2: *Trebellium dum uterque dedignatur*. Furneaux says "dedignatur: so with acc. in Verg. Aen. 4. 536 and Ov." Cf. Seneca, *Ad Helu.*, 12, 7; *Ad Polyb.*, 17, 2; Curtius, VI, 10, 23; 11, 23; VIII, 1, 9.

XV, 2, 4: *mandauitque Tigranen Armenia exturbare*. Furneaux says that a simple infinitive with *mando* occurs in Martial, I, 88, 10. Cf. Vitruvius, VI, praef. 1; Seneca, *De Ben.*, VII, 22, 1; and also Statius, *Silu.*, IV, 4, 60.

12, 1: *onusta frumenti*. For a genitive after *onustus* Furneaux cites Plautus, *Aul.*, 611 and says no other instance appears to be found. Cf. *Bell. Afr.*, 63, 3.

37, 3: *tenebrae incedebant*. Jacob says that *incedebant* is poetical for *ingruebant* and quotes Silius, VIII, 337-8. Cf. Columella, II, 10, 30 and XI, 1, 18.

69, 2: *mersatur*. Furneaux, Vol. I, p. 65, says that *mersare* is apparently not used in prose before Tacitus. Cf. Seneca, *N. Q.*, IV, 13, 10.

Hist., I, 13, 2: *credo et rei publicae curam subisse*. W. Heraeus repeats his father's remark that *subire* is used absolutely "nach dem Vorgange Vergils"; and Davies, after saying, like Spooner and Goelzer, that the use is poetical, adds "earlier prose writers say *animum* or *mentem* *subire*: cf. Liv. 36. 20." At XXXVI, 20, 3 Livy certainly says *cogitatio animum subit*; and cf. X, 45, 2; XXXVII, 49, 3; XL, 8, 9; and XLV, 5, 11. But at XL, 8, 10 he writes *subituram uobis aliquando germanitatis memoriam*, and he writes like Tacitus at XLI, 19, 4, for which XXV, 24, 14 had prepared the way.

17, 2: *male coercitam famam supprimentes augebant*. Wolff and Goelzer say that this use of *male* is poetical, and Davies, after quoting Livy, XXXV, 49, 10 with the false reference XXV, 49, says "earlier the use seems to be poetical, except for *male sanus* (Cic. *ad Att.* IX. 15)." This is not true: cf., for example,

Cicero, *In Cat.*, III, 22; *Ad Fam.*, XV, 4, 10; *Ad Att.*, II, 1, 5; V, 20, 5; Livy, I, 25, 12; X, 5, 11; XXIII, 24, 9; XXXVIII, 21, 4; Seneca, *Suas.*, VII, 6; *De Ira*, I, 13, 3; *De Ben.*, II, 1, 2; *N. Q.*, I, 4, 1; *Ep.*, VIII, 5; CXII, 4; CXX, 15; Petronius, *Sat.*, 87, 3.

37, 1: *nec priuatum me uocare sustineo*. Davies says that *sustineo* is used with an infinitive earlier than Tacitus only by poets. It is so used in Livy, XXIII, 9, 7 and by the elder Seneca, Velleius Paterculus, Valerius Maximus, Curtius, Columella, Petronius, the elder Pliny, Quintilian, and the younger Pliny.

II, 76, 2: *nec speciem adulantis expaueris*. W. Heraeus refers to Draeger by whom we are reminded that Horace once uses the latter verb transitively. Cf. Seneca, *Contr.*, II, 3, 10; and Pliny, *Pan.*, 20, 2.

III, 71, 4: *traxerunt flamمام*. W. Heraeus quotes Ovid, *Met.*, IV, 675. Cf. Seneca, *N. Q.*, I, 1, 8.

Agric., 33, 1: *audentissimi*. Anderson repeats Furneaux's remark that *audens* occurs perhaps in no earlier prose. Cf. Quintilian, XII, 10, 23: *latior et audentior et excelsior*. Gudeman says the superlative occurs "only here and in Caes. *Gall.* VI. 2. 10," a reference which turns out to be an error for Gellius, VI, 2, 10.²

² Gudeman's commentary usefully supplements Furneaux's and Anderson's, and corrects it, for instance, at 25, 1 and 46, 3; but he is a poor critic and sometimes a careless annotator. At 35, 1: *statimque ad arma discursum* he says "the same phrase is found in Hom. *Od.* XXIV. 486, and Sen. *Dial.* III. 2. 3." I can make nothing of the reference to Homer; and the second reference seems to be an error for Seneca, *Dial.*, V, 2, 3, which is cited by C. W. Mendell, *T. A. P. A.*, LII (1921), p. 64 and apparently there contemplated as the source of the phrase in Tacitus. The phrase is not a rarity: cf. for instance, Livy, V, 36, 5; XXV, 37, 11; XXVII, 41, 8; Seneca, *Suas.*, VI, 5; Seneca, *De Breu. Vit.*, 3, 1; Curtius, IX, 7, 8. (Mendell, *loc. cit.*, seems to regard 2, 3: *loquendi audiendique commercio* as perhaps due to Livy, V, 15, 5: *commercium sermonum*, as if *commercium* were not often so used. Anderson says on 31, 3: *sumite animum* "as in Liv. 6. 23. 3" and on p. lxxxv he says "to Ovid he may have been indebted" for it.) At *Germania*, 21, 2: *monstrator hospitii et comes* Gudeman says that the identical phrase, *monstrator hospitii*, occurs in Seneca, *Dial.*, VI, 25, 2. What is to be seen there is *ignotarum urbium monstrator hospiti gratus est*. At *Agric.*, 26, 2: *securi pro salute* he says "securi pro for the more usual de occurs in Tac. *Hist.* IV. 58, pro me securior, and is not rare elsewhere, e. g., Sall. *Iug.* 64. 5; Liv. II. 24. 4." I see no examples in these last two passages; but I

There are many passages in Tacitus where the commentators omit to show that he is influenced by reminiscence of a passage or passages in an earlier author. On the other hand there are many places where reminiscence has been suggested unreasonably. For example:

Ann., I, 42, 3: *egregiam duci uestro gratiam refertis*. Instead of quoting Curtius, VIII, 7, 4: *quibus tu egregiam gratiam retulisti*, Furneaux says that in his frequent ironical use of *egregius* "Tacitus appears to follow Vergil (Aen. 4, 53),"³ as if there were not more than half a dozen examples in Cicero and others in Catullus, Curtius, Seneca, Quintilian, and Statius.⁴

51, 1: *auidas legiones*. Furneaux says "Tacitus appears to follow Horace (Od. 3. 4. 58) in using this word, without qualification, of eagerness for battle." Cf. Statius, *Theb.*, X, 859; XI, 535; Silius, III, 305 and IX, 316.

65, 4: *utque tali in tempore sibi quisque properus*. Furneaux says that the words *tali in tempore* may be a reminiscence of Lucretius, I, 93: *nec miserae prodesse in tali tempore quibat*, as if there were not examples of that phrase, for instance, in Sallust, *Cat.*, 48, 5; Livy, XXII, 35, 7; XXIV, 3, 12; XXX, 37, 8; XXXIV, 27, 6; and, with *ut*, as in Tacitus, in XXIV, 28, 1.

III, 74, 2: *ne Cirtensium pagi impune traherentur*. Furneaux says that this use of *traho* "appears taken from" Sallust, *Ep. Mithr.*, 17. Cf. Sallust, *Iug.*, 41, 5.

IV, 68, 3: *florentis domus amicus afflictam deseruisset*. Furneaux says that the contrast of *florentis* and *afflictam* is apparently taken from Cicero, *Pro Quinctio*, 93, as if it did not occur elsewhere, for instance, at Nepos, *Att.*, 11, 4; Cicero, *Ad*

notice that the second has an example of *pro* after *metus*. At 42, 2 Gudeman says that *offensus* is used with an infinitive in only two other passages, although Anderson cites three examples. At *Germ.*, 7, 2 he says of *conglobatio* that it is found only here, though it occurs in half a dozen other authors. At 17, 2: *eisque (sc. amictus) purpura uariant*, he says of *uario* that "in prose elsewhere it is used only in a figurative sense." At 20, 2 he calls *iuuenta* "poetic and post-Augustan for *iuuentus*," as if it were not used by Livy. At 31, 3 he says of *mansuesco* that "the intransitive use of the finite verb is extremely rare": on the contrary it is the transitive use which is extremely rare.

³ He means IV, 93.

⁴ At III, 6, 1. Furneaux even says that "honourable" is "apparently a Tacitean sense of the word" *egregius*.

Att., III, 10, 2; *Livy*, VII, 20, 5; XXVIII, 41, 17; and *Seneca*, *De Tranq. Animi*, 5, 3.

VI, 40, 3: *finem uitae sibi posuit*. Luise Robbert, *De Tacito Lucani Imitatore*, p. 77 says “nescio an non insolite dicta sint ultima uerba pro nostro ‘seinem Leben ein Ende machen,’ quod quantum uideo alibi exprimitur ‘finem uitae imponere vel facere.’ Quare fortasse non est alienum credere Tacitum secutum esse Lucanum . . . V, 314: liceat scelerum tibi ponere finem.” Cf. *Seneca*, *Ag.*, 609: *audetque uitae ponere finem* and *for ponere finem* also *Ovid*, *Trist.*, IV, 8, 5; *Seneca*, *De Ben.*, V, 18, 1 and *Lucan*, X, 42.

XI, 7, 3: *cogitaret plebem quae toga enitesceret*. Furneaux says the use of *enitescere* in this sense appears to be taken from *Sallust*, *Cat.*, 54, 4. Cf., for instance, *Cicero*, *Pro Murena*, 32 and *Ad Att.*, II, 1, 3.

XIV, 34, 1: *congredi acie*. Furneaux says this expression is taken from *Livy*, VII, 22, 4. Cf. *Livy*, III, 61, 14.

Hist., III, 3: *descendisse in causam*. Spooner says Tacitus here follows *Livy*, XXXVI, 7, 6. Cf. *Cicero*, *Ad Att.*, VIII, 1, 3.

34, 1: *bellis externis intacta*. Andresen quotes *Lucan*, III, 427. Luise Robbert, *op. cit.*, p. 87 had suggested that Tacitus was perhaps thinking of *Sallust*, *Ep. Mithr.*, 15. Cf. *Livy*, III, 26, 2 and *Silius*, II, 661.

52, 1: *necterent moras*. M. Zimmermann, *De Tacito Senecae Philosophi Imitatore*, p. 57, like C. Heraeus before him and W. Heraeus after him, quotes *Seneca*, *De Ira*, III, 39, 3. Cf. *Valerius Flaccus*, III, 374-5; *Statius*, *Theb.*, III, 495 and IV, 677.

IV, 18, 1: *Romanum nomen*. Goelzer calls this an “expression empruntée à T.-Live,” as if it were not to be seen in *Sallust*, *Cat.*, 52, 24.

29, 3: *exhausta nocte*. Luise Robbert, *op. cit.*, p. 52 says that *exhaurire* is used in the sense of *exigere* only here and in *Lucan*, V, 44. Cf. *Statius*, *Theb.*, X, 383 and *Silu.*, III, 5, 40.

57, 2: *ruptores foederum*. Goelzer, who at 26, 1 calls *minus frugum et plures qui consumerent* a “réminiscence” of *Horace*, *Ep.*, I, 2, 27: *fruges consumere nati*, here says “réminiscence de Tite-Live XXI. 40. 11.” Cf. *Livy*, I, 28, 6 and IV, 19, 3.

Many words and expressions in Tacitus occur much earlier, or much earlier in prose, than the commentators would lead one to suppose. For example:

Ann., I, 5, 1: *grauescere*. Furneaux says that the previous use of the verb, except in a passage of Pliny, *N. H.*, is wholly poetical. Cf. Sallust, *Hist.*, frag. III, 78.

16, 1: *Pannonicas legiones seditio incessit*. Furneaux speaks of the "acc. pers." as "after Livy." Cf. Sallust, *Ep. Mithr.*, 15.

28, 3: *grati in uulgas*. W. Heraeus says "gratus in nach Liv. 9. 33." Cf. Cicero, *Ad Att.*, II, 22, 3 and Livy, II, 8, 2.

48, 2: *se ipsos morti eximant*. Nipperdey, Andresen, Draeger, and W. Heraeus all say that the dative is the usage of poets and of Silver Latin. Cf. Livy, VIII, 35, 5.

49, 1: *civilium armorum facies*. W. Heraeus says "facies 'Bild' gebraucht Tacitus oft, um das Äussere einer Sache zu bezeichnen, wie facies belli, pugnae, uictoriae, laborum, locorum. So nur Vergil und die Prosaiker des silbernen Zeitalters"; as if Sallust does not use the very expressions *facies belli* and *facies locorum*.

64, 1: *perfringere stationes . . . nisi*. W. Heraeus repeats Draeger's statement that *nitor* is used with the infinitive "nach dem Vorgange des Sallust und Livius." Furneaux says the infinitive is so used by Sallust, *Iug.*, 25, 9, Nepos, and Ovid. Cf. Sisenna, 28 and Caesar, *B. G.*, VI, 37, 10.

65, 4: *haesere caeno fossisque*. Commentators speak of the ablatives as poetical or "nach neuerm Sprachgebrauch." Cf. Cicero, *De Re Pub.*, VI, 18.

74, 1: *Granium Marcellum . . . maiestatis postulauit*. Furneaux says that the genitive with *postulo* is confined to Tacitus and Suetonius. W. Heraeus says that it is found in Suetonius and "Rhetoren bei Sen. rh." Cf. Caesar, *B. C.*, III, 83, 2.

II, 4, 3: *effugere agitauerit*. W. Heraeus says "agitare c. infin. wie bei Vergil u. Curtius." Cf. Plautus, *Rud.*, 936-7 and Nepos, *Ham.*, 1, 4.

20, 3: *dedit impetum*. W. Heraeus repeats Draeger's statement that Livy was the first to use this expression. Cf. *Bell. Hisp.*, 25, 8.

23, 1: *pluris . . . Oceano inuexit*. Furneaux says "inuexit with dat. in Suet. Aug. 41 and Curt. 9. 2. 27." Cf. Livy, I, 59, 10; XXII, 5, 8; XXV, 40, 10; and XLIV, 2, 3.

33, 4: *adiecerat*. Furneaux says that *adicio* is apparently not so used of speakers with an accusative and infinitive earlier than Velleius, although it is so used of speakers at least four times in Livy and of writers at least once in Varro and twice in Livy.

37, 1: *inlectus*. Furneaux says that *inlicere* is thus used without a bad sense in XIII, 37, 3 and Velleius, II, 89, 4. Nipperdey had also quoted Silius, IV, 803. Cf. Varro, *L. L.*, VI, 94.

63, 3: *in destruendo eo*. Furneaux quotes without disapproval Draeger's statement that the use of *destruo* with a personal object is confined to the younger Pliny and Tacitus. It occurs in several writers after Tacitus and before him, for instance, in Velleius, II, 48, 2; Valerius Maximus, V, 3, ext. 3; Seneca, *De Tranq. Animi*, 2, 10; Quintilian, V, 7, 26 and VIII, 3, 21.

III, 7, 1: *scelerum probationes*. Furneaux says that *probatio* is so used first in Quintilian, V, 10, 102. Cf., for instance, Seneca, *Ep.*, LXXXIII, 8; XCIV, 10 and 27; XCV, 61; and *De Ben.*, IV, 16, 2.

IV, 23, 1: *incuriosus*. Furneaux says that *incuriosus* is post-Augustan, Summers on *Hist.*, III, 56, 2 calls it a silver word, and W. Heraeus here repeats Draeger's statement that it is "silbernes Latein, doch hat Livius das Adverb." Both the adjective and the adverb are used by Sallust; cf. *Hist.*, frag. IV, 36 and II, 42.

49, 3: *aeque quam*. Edwards calls this a silver age construction. It is found in Plautus and Livy.

56, 1: *illos . . . condidisset*. W. Heraeus says "condere mit pers. Objekt wie Curtius. z. B. 6. 2. 14" and Andresen says "wie Curt. VI. 2. 14, VIII. 8. 11." Cf. Sallust, *Ep. Mithr.*, 17, to say nothing of Virgil, *Aen.*, I, 33.

VI, 7, 2: *admonuit C. Cestium . . . dicere*. Furneaux says that *admoneo* "takes an infinitive" also in Augustan poets and Livy. He cites *Agric.*, 25, 3, which is not a parallel, and I doubt the truth of his statement about Livy. Cf. Cicero, *In Verr.*, II, 1, 63; *Pro Caelio*, 34; *Auct. Ad Her.*, II, 31; and Hirtius, *Bell. Gall.*, VIII, 12, 7.

XII, 37, 2: *inclaruisset*. Furneaux says that this verb appears to be first used by the elder Pliny. Cf. Valerius Maximus, V, 4, ext. 3. At VI, 25, 1 he classes *progero*, which occurs as early as Vitruvius, X, 16, 9 among the verbs compounded with *pro* which date "from this age"; and at XIII, 50, 1 he cites *impetus* meaning "impulse" from Curtius and Suetonius, as if it were not so used by Livy.

XV, 21, 2: *quaedam immo uirtutes odio sunt*. Draeger and Becher speak of anastrophe of *immo* as occurring first in Livy

in prose. On XI, 30, 2 Furneaux says it "is first in Livy." Cf. Plautus, *Aul.*, 765; *Capt.*, 354; Cicero, *In Verr.*, II, 3, 25.

69, 3: *imaginatus*. It is said by Draeger and Becher and by Nipperdey and Andresen, both here and on 36, 1, that *imaginor* does not occur before the elder Pliny. Cf. Seneca, *Contr.*, exc. V, 4 and V, 5; Seneca, *De Const. Sap.*, VI, 7 and *Ep.*, CII, 28.

XVI, 17, 3: *adsimilatis Lucani litteris*. Furneaux speaks of *adsimilo* with the meaning of "counterfeit" in Plautus, Terence, Virgil, and the elder Pliny. Cf. Cicero, *Pro Clu.*, 36.

Hist., I, 13, 3: *suspectum in eadem Poppaea*. For *in* W. Heraeus surprisingly adds *schol. Iuu.*, I, 155 but not *Valerius Maximus*, V, 9, 3 to his father's quotations from Suetonius.

48, 1: *maiori fratri*. On the absence of *natu* Valmaggi says "come in *Liv. XXIII. 30. 14.*" Livy has several other examples and cf. Cicero, *Pro Cael.*, 36; *Brut.*, 228; *Ad Q. fr.*, I, 3, 3.

55, 1: *initium erumpendi circumspectabant*. Davies says that *circumspectare* and *circumspicere* in the sense of "look about for" seem to be post-Ciceronian. For the former cf. Plautus, *Pseud.*, 912 and Terence, *Eun.*, 291; for the latter cf. Caesar, *B. G.*, VI, 43, 4.

II, 20, 1: *uxorem . . . grauabantur*. Goelzer speaks of the construction as poetic and "reprise par les prosateurs postérieurs à Sénèque." Furneaux on *Ann.*, III, 59, 4 says that the usage first appears in Horace. Cf. Plautus, *Rud.*, 434-5; Seneca, *Contr.*, II, 1, 32; Seneca, *De Clem.*, I, 13, 1; *De Ira*, II, 8, 2; and *Ep.*, XXIV, 25.

59, 3: *laudatos curuli suae circumposuit*. Goelzer says "le datif est une construction propre à l'époque impériale." Cf. *Bell. Alex.*, 72, 2.

67, 2: *ad curas intento*. Valmaggi and Goelzer say that this construction is found as early as Livy. Cf. Caesar, *B. G.*, III, 26, 2.

78, 3: *ampliare seruitia*. Valmaggi says *ampliare* in the sense of *augere* is poetical and Silver Latin. Cf. *Bell. Hisp.*, 42, 2.

80, 2: *ostentator*. Goelzer says this word first occurs in Livy. Cf. *Auct. Ad Her.*, IV, 50.

III, 45, 1: *sustulere animos*. Goelzer says this is an expression which "parait avoir été créée par Tite-Live." It is at least as old as Lucilius, 699.

71, 2: *arcessere tormenta aut missilia tela*. W. Heraeus says "arcessere mit sachl. Obj. wie *Liv. XXVII. 25. 11.*" Cf.

Plautus, *Bacch.*, 354; Cicero, *In Verr.*, II, 5, 45; *Ad Fam.*, VII, 23, 3; *Ad Att.*, XVI, 11, 4; Sallust, *Hist.*, frag. II, 97.

IV, 1, 2: *egentissimus*. V. D'Agostino says "superlativo usato pure in 3.47 e in Livio," as if there were not at least seven examples in Cicero and one in Sallust. There are a great many other notes of this kind in D'Agostino's book.

2, 2: *exstinguique reliqua belli*. W. Heraeus strangely says "Die Metapher *exst. bellum* schon Planc. bei Cic. fam. X, 23, 5 und Mon. Ancyrr. VI, 13." Cf. Plautus, *Amph.*, 189; *Persa*, 754; and Cicero, *Pro Sestio*, 51.

5, 2: *libertatem hausit*. Carl Heraeus, who is followed by his son and by Goelzer, quotes Horace, *Sat.*, II, 4, 95 and Livy, XXXIX, 26, 7. It is strange to forget Cicero, *De Re Pub.*, I, 66, from Plato, *Rep.*, 562 D.

10: *circumuentum arguebat*. Goelzer says the construction is as in Livy, XXX, 23, 5, as if it could not be found in Plautus and Cicero.

30, 2: *machinamentum*. D'Agostino says this is "altresì parola liviana." I believe it occurs only once in Livy, and it occurs before him in Sisenna, 91.

58, 1: *pro uobis sollicitior*. Goelzer compares Livy, XXXVIII, 9, 4, as if the construction were not to be found in Cicero, *De Amic.*, 45.

73, 2: *bella tractauerimus*. Goelzer calls the expression "un peu ambitieuse." W. Heraeus cites Livy, XXIII, 28, 4. Cf. Coelius, 16; Ovid, *A. A.*, I, 182; Livy, V, 12, 7; Pliny, *N. H.*, XVIII, 19; Silius, II, 113.

77, 2: *felici temeritate*. W. Heraeus cites Seneca, Curtius, and Florus, but not Livy, II, 51, 9; XXVIII, 42, 7.

V, 6, 1: *fragmina*. W. Heraeus calls this word "poetisch und nachklassisch." Cf. Sisenna, 11.

10, 2: *pace . . . parta*. Goelzer quotes Suetonius, *Aug.*, 22. Cf. Nepos, *Epaminondas*, 5, 3.

13, 2: *quae ambages Vespasianum ac Titum praedixerat*. For the impersonal subject Goelzer quotes from Florus and Justin. It is strange to forget Virgil, *Ecl.*, I, 16-17, and cf. Seneca, *N. Q.*, II, 32, 5.

25, 3: *bellum . . . sumeretur*. Although Carl Heraeus had mentioned Sallust, Spooner says "this phrase, a copy, perhaps, of the Greek πόλεμον αἱρεσθαι, is taken from Liv. 8. 4. 3." W.

Heraeus refers to Heinsius on Ovid, *Her.*, XVII, 371, who gives examples from Silius, Petronius, and later writers. Gudeman on *Agric.*, 16, 1 calls the phrase "a Sallustian expression." Cf. Plautus, *Cist.*, 300.

I add a few examples of the many other erroneous or misleading notes in the commentaries.

Ann., I, 43, 2: *neque enim di sinant ut . . . sit.* Draeger and Furneaux say that the construction with *ut* is found only a few times in Terence and once in Curtius. W. Heraeus says it is found in Terence and in Silver Latin. Cf. Livy, XXXIV, 24, 2; Curtius, V, 8, 13; X, 6, 20; Petronius, 112, 7 and 126, 9. In all these examples the verb *sino* is negatived and expresses a wish; in the first three the perfect subjunctive is used.

51, 3: *latera et frontem modice adsultantes.* Furneaux says that *adsultare* is apparently⁵ not found earlier than the elder Pliny, and Andresen repeats Nipperdey's statement that it is poetical with an accusative or dative. Cf. Germanicus, *Arat.*, 299 and Seneca, *De Ira*, III, 25, 3.

59, 1: *ut quibusque bellum inuitis aut cupientibus erat.* Furneaux quotes without disapproval Nipperdey's remark, which is repeated by Andresen, that only *uelens* is elsewhere so used. Cf. Fronto, 228, 5, N. and Julius Valerius, II, 15, p. 77, 13 Kübler.

III, 56, 2: *appellatione aliqua cetera imperia praemineret.* Furneaux, Vol. I, p. 45 says that Tacitus appears to be the first prose writer to use *praemineo* thus with an accusative, but in his note here and on XII, 12, 1 he refers to Sallust. In spite of this, W. Heraeus repeats Draeger's statement that *praemineo* with an accusative is first found in the *Annals*. Cf. also Seneca, *Contr.*, I, 4, 12.

60, 1: *receptabantur.* Draeger, Furneaux, and W. Heraeus say that this verb occurs elsewhere only in poets and Livy, V, 8, 2. Cf. *Ann.*, IV, 41, 1 and Seneca, *Ep.*, XCII, 10.

67, 2: *neque refellere aut eludere dabatur.* Furneaux says that the verb is used thus with an infinitive after poets, Quintilian, and Pliny, *Pan.*, 50. W. Heraeus says that before Tacitus it is "nur poetisch" and that Tacitus "hat, wie alle späteren Prosaiker, nur das Passiv dari mit dem Infin. verbunden." Here

⁵ Later, on *Agric.*, 26, 1, he says "the word appears first in the elder Pliny," and this false statement is repeated by Anderson.

are references to some prose examples before Tacitus: Vitruvius, III, 3, 5; VII, 10, 4; Seneca, *De Clem.*, I, 8, 3; *N. Q.*, V, 8, 3; *Ep.*, CXXIV, 20; Mela, I, 43; Pliny, *N. H.*, VII, 57; X, 173; XVI, 17; Quintilian, VI, 3, 100; IX, 1, 20; X, 7, 22; XI, 3, 125; XI, 3, 127. The younger Pliny has an example in *Ep.*, VIII, 20, 1 and four in *Pan.* The active *dare* is used before Tacitus in Vitruvius, VII, 10, 4 and after him by Tertullian, *De Test. An.*, 5; *De Resurr.*, 17, p. 48, 1; Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.*, 5, 13 and Martianus Capella, II, 149.

XII, 49, 1: *regium insigne sumere cohortatur*. Furneaux says that *cohortor* with an infinitive is found elsewhere apparently only in *Bell. Alex.*, 21, 1. He must have misunderstood that passage. An example is to be found in *Auct. Ad Her.*, XII, 3, 4.⁶

XIV, 14, 3: *euulgatus*. Furneaux says that the only example of *euulgo* outside Tacitus is in Livy, IX, 46, 5, and Weissenborn and Mueller and Luterbacher say that there is no other example in Livy. Cf. XLIV, 27, 13.

55, 1: *id primum tui muneric habeo*. Jacob and Furneaux say that the expression *muneric tui* is from poets and quote Horace, *Odes*, IV, 3, 21-22 and Ovid, *Trist.*, I, 6, 6. Draeger and Becher quote Quintilian, X, 2, 7: *nihil habebimus nisi beneficii alieni*. Compare rather Pliny, *Pan.*, 52, 6 and 75, 5.

Hist., I, 18, 1: *non terruit Galbam quominus in castra pergeret*. Davies says "an Augustan writer would have used *absterruit* or *deterruit*." At all events Caesar uses *terreret* in *B. G.*, VII, 49, 2.

18, 2: *in officio fore*. W. Heraeus repeats his father's note "wie Nep. Eum. 6. 1." He means 6, 4; but cf., for instance, Caesar, *B. G.*, V, 3, 3; Cicero, *Ad Att.*, I, 10, 2; V, 20, 9; and Livy, VIII, 19, 13.

69: *effusis lacrimis*. W. Heraeus repeats his father's quotation of Livy, XXVII, 19, 12 and his remark, which is reproduced by

⁶ Some of the many other notes of Furneaux's which could be shown to contain what is false are those, in the first three books, on I, 3, 5 *adsciri*, 17, 1 *contionabundus*, 32, 2 *animi ferox*, 35, 4 *attinuissent*, 50, 1 *concaedibus*, 62, 2 *formidolosorem*, 66, 1 *auersa hosti*, 70, 2 *breuia*, 77, 4 *lucaris*, II, 21, 1 *adpressum*, 24, 3 *secundante*, 46, 5 *firmator*, 72, 2 *magnitudinem*, 73, 2 *modicum uoluptatum*, 80, 2 *accitu*, III, 38, 1 *complementum*, 43, 2 *gentico*.

Valmaggi, that "Cic. sagt lacrimas profundere und lacrimarum uim effundere." But cf. *Pro Planc.*, 101 and *De Re Pub.*, VI, 14.

83, 2: *imus ad bellum*. W. Heraeus repeats his father's statement that *ire in bellum* occurs first in Justin, Gellius, and Fronto. Cf. Ovid, *A. A.*, III, 3 and Livy, XXXVIII, 23, 9.

II, 46, 1: *ire in aciem*. W. Heraeus repeats his father's remark "ire in aciem wie Liv. 28. 22. 8 ire in proelium." But the phrase is in Livy, VII, 32, 10 as well as Valerius Maximus, V, 8, 5; Curtius, V, 1, 18; and Quintilian, IX, 2, 85.

78, 2: *recursabant animo uetera omina*. W. Heraeus says *recurrare* occurs in a metaphorical sense "sonst nur bei Vergil (A. I, 662, IV. 3) und Iul. Val. Alex. p. 98, 2 Kübler." Cf. Virgil, *Aen.*, XII, 802; Statius, *Theb.*, I, 316; Silius, II, 519; VI, 555; and *Paneg.*, VIII, 18.

III, 10, 2: *interceptorem*. Andresen repeats Wolff's statement that this word occurs only here and in Livy, IV, 50, 1. Cf. Livy, III, 72, 4 and Valerius Maximus, IX, 11, 4.

48, 1: *hostem abortus coegit in naues*. W. Heraeus repeats from his father "gew. compulit in naues. (Liv. X. 2. 2)," and Goelzer says "coegit, au lieu du terme classique compulit, que Tacite a trouvé trop banal." Livy says *compellere in naues* several times; but cf. XXXVI, 3, 5 and XXXVII, 29, 3.

65, 2: *de pace ponendisque per condicionem armis*. W. Heraeus, after quoting Cicero, *Ad Fam.*, VI, 2, 2 and Mela, I, 38, says "sonst setzen die Historiker den Plural." Cf. Livy, XXIII, 12, 10 and Curtius, IV, 11, 13.

IV, 69, 1: *iamque super caput legiones*. W. Heraeus remarks that this expression is used by Sallust, Cicero, and Livy always with *supra*. D'Agostino says "super caput sc. 'esse'; formula d'uso liviano"; but I do not believe him. For *super* before Tacitus cf. Seneca, *Contr.*, IX, 6, 18, and Seneca, *De Ben.*, VII, 14, 5, and *Ep.*, LIII, 13.

Agric., 22, 3: *aestate atque hieme iuxta*. Gudeman calls this use of *iuxta* "an archaic and frequent Sallustian usage." Andresen, *Wochenschrift für klass. Phil.*, 1916, col. 402 quoted Livy, V, 6, 5. *Iuxta* is used in the same manner in III, 33, 10; IX, 13, 9; XXIV, 20, 13 and 37, 4; and compare also Pliny, *N. H.*, II, 136: *iuxta hieme et aestate*.

There is no kind of error which one must not be prepared to find repeated by a commentator from one or more of his prede-

cessors. In 1894 Lejay published a commentary on the first book of Lucan which he explained was put together in haste and in which he said on *non sponte ducum* in line 99 that it is the “premier emploi de cette construction, en poésie, fréquente dans Lucain; Tacite l'introduit en prose.” In 1940 R. J. Getty writes in a Pitt Press edition of the first book of Lucan “Lejay observes that this is the first occurrence of the word with the genitive, a construction which Tacitus introduced into prose.” If Getty did not know this statement about Tacitus to be false, he could have consulted Lewis and Short’s dictionary. In 1888 Wolff in his note on *Hist.*, IV, 34, 5: *suspectus bellum malle* quoted Sallust, *Iug.*, 70, 1: *per idem tempus Bomilcar, cuius impulsu Iugurtha deditio*ne*m*em, *quam metu deseruit, inceperat, suspectus regi et ipse eum suspiciens nouas res cupere, ad perniciem eius dolum quaerere, die noctuque fatigare animum*, because he supposed that passage contained an example of the same construction. The passage is quoted again by Andresen in 1926 and by D’Agostino in 1935; and I do not suppose that the last has been heard of it. At *Ann.*, III, 1, 1 Furneaux quotes without disapproval Draeger’s statement, which is repeated by Jacob and W. Heraeus, that *nescius* with the genitive of a gerund is found only here and in 67, 2; in fact it occurs again in VI, 11, 3.⁷ At III, 30, 4 W. Heraeus repeats Draeger’s statement that Tacitus always writes *satias* in the *Annals*, when in fact he writes *satietas* in I, 49, 2. At *Hist.*, I, 4, 2: *posse principem alibi quam Romae fieri*, commentators give us the following: Carl and Wilhelm Heraeus “*quam* nachklassisch statt *ac*”; Valmaggi “*alibi quam* per *alibi ac*”; Davies “the classical phrase is *alibi ac*”; Goelzer “*quam* pour *atque, après . . . alibi* n’est pas classique.” Does any ancient Latin author say *alibi ac*, or are all these five scholars deluded? At *Hist.*, I, 86, 2 for *iacentia* W. Heraeus intended to give the reference Seneca, *Ep.*, LI, 1 but wrongly gave Seneca, *N. Q.*, VI, 1, 2, which is rightly given seven lines lower down the page; into the second edition of Valmaggi’s commentary Castiglioni copies the wrong reference. When commentators are found to be as ready as they are to repeat errors, it is not surprising that they are often unwilling to repeat the truth. This readiness and this unwillingness are

⁷ Kühner-Stegmann’s *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, I, 739 strangely adds “u. ö.” to its quotation of *Annals*, III, 1, 1.

both in evidence at *Germania*, 3, 2: *aram quin etiam Vlisci consecratam*. Wolff in 1915 correctly says that *quin etiam* is postpositive in Tacitus except in *Dial.*, 29, 2 and *Ann.*, XII, 61, 2; Gudeman in 1928 falsely says that it is always postpositive in Tacitus; and in 1938 Anderson, although in his preface he acknowledges obligations to Wolff, repeats "quin etiam, always thus used postpositively by Tacitus."⁸

The notes in this paper have been put together with a faint hope of stopping or averting the repetition of some of the errors in commentaries on Tacitus. It is true that our appreciation of his work is irremediably limited both by the loss of his sources and by such other losses as those of the Greek Hellenistic histories, of the greater part of Livy, and of all but fragments of the *Histories* of Sallust; but commentators could do more for an understanding of him if they had a better knowledge of the literature that has survived.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

KING'S COLLEGE,
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM,
NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

⁸ This is not the only place where Anderson is in error about *quin etiam*. At *Agrie.*, 26, 2 he repeats Furneaux's statement that *quin etiam* is in anastrophe once each in the *Histories* and *Annals*, after Virgil. There are examples in the *Histories* at II, 17, 2 and 64, 2; and there is an example before Virgil in Lucretius, I, 731.

THE MONKEYS OF ARCHILOCHUS.

The title which I have chosen for this paper is a quotation from one of the Platonic discourses of the Greek sophist and orator, Aelius Aristeides. The whole passage which includes these seemingly strange words, and mention of the "tragic cow," is one of the most obscure and most disputed sections of the long apology *Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων*. It is Aristeides' main purpose both to take a stand against the bitter attacks which Plato in his *Gorgias* directed against the four Athenian statesmen, Pericles, Miltiades, Cimon, and Themistocles, and to stress the importance of rhetoric for human life. Aristeides frankly admits in this discourse that philosophy has attained its culminating point in Plato, and he feels, or at least pretends to feel, that any attack upon Plato is almost like blasphemy. Likewise he feels no less strongly that rhetoric has attained its zenith in bringing forth Demosthenes. Whoever ventures to criticize rhetoric with insufficient reasons commits, therefore, a crime against Demosthenes and all his serious followers in general, and by inference against Aristeides in particular, who as Demosthenes *redivivus* claims for himself the undisputed rhetorical leadership of his own day.

Aristeides, II, 397, 3 ff., ed. Dindorf.

Ἄλλὰ γὰρ οὐκ εἰ Πλάτων ὁ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοσοῦτον ὑπερφέρων καὶ δικαίως μέγιστον ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ φρονῶν κατηγορῆσαι τινῶν ἡξίωσε μεγέθει τινὶ καὶ ἔξονσίᾳ φύσεως, τοῦτο καὶ μάλιστ' ἄν τις ἀγανακτήσειεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ τῶν κομιδῆ τινες οὐδενὸς ἀξίων ἀφορμῇ ταύτη χρώμενοι μελέτην ἥδη τὸ πρᾶγμα πεποίηνται καὶ τολμῶσι καὶ περὶ Δημοσθένους, ὃν ἐγὸν φαίνη ἄν Ἐρμοῦ τινος Δογίου τύπον εἰς ἀνθρώπους κατελθεῖν, ὅτι ἄν τύχωσι βλασφημεῖν. καίτοι τίς ἄν εἰς ζῶντας τελῶν τούτων ἀνάσχοιτο, οἱ πλεῖστοι μὲν σολοικύζονται ἡ φθέγγονται, ὑπερορῶστ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ὅστιν αὐτοῖς ὑπερορᾶσθαι προσήκει, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἔξετάζονται, αὐτοὺς δὲ οὐδεπώποτε ἡξίωσαν, καὶ σεμινύνονται μὲν τὴν ἀρετήν, ἀσκοῦσι δὲ οὐ πάντα, περιέρχονται δὲ ἄλλως "βροτῶν εἶδωλα καμόντων," "Ησιόδου "κηφῆνες," Ἀρχιλόχου "πίθηκοι," δύο μορφὰς ἔχοντες ἀντὶ τριῶν τῆς τραγικῆς βούς, τῶν ἴματιῶν τῶν ἡπημένων οὐδενὸς διαφέροντες, τὰ μὲν ἔξω σεμνοί, τὰ δὲ ἔνδον ἄλλος ἄν εἰδεῖ τις.

The problem in question is how to explain as far as possible the meaning of the allusions in the difficult passage which I have quoted above. For long sections of the discourse valuable

and learned scholia are available which will make the interpretation much easier if they are used in the right manner.¹ In our section of the discourse, however, matters are different. Here the scholia are scarce and brief, and their transmission in the manuscripts is so deplorable that the modern interpreter may be inclined to consider them useless. This impression is considerably strengthened when we read the commentaries in the editions of Frommel² and Dindorf.³ It is hard, indeed, to find in them an appropriate starting point for an interpretation. It becomes evident that now and then the original writer of the scholia and much more the redactor who is responsible for their present shape were unable to overcome all the difficulties which stood in their way, because they did not understand sufficiently the meaning of all the sentences or even words of their author. In many cases they preferred, therefore, either not to interpret the passages at all or to conceal their ignorance behind meaningless phrases. It will also appear that some useful contributions which the original author was able to make have lost their value because of recent errors, transformations, and redactions, partly also through mechanical mistakes and more or less arbitrary and deliberate omissions by which appreciable material was lost. In spite of and against all these odds it is tempting to use the scholia on this passage for a more exact explanation of Aristeides' words. Such an attempt is not hopeless, provided we succeed in finding the right way to analyze the chaotic compilations which were printed by Frommel and Dindorf in their respective editions.

The last long section of the discourse in defense of the four statesmen has in the manuscripts the title *Kouὴ ἀπολογία*. It begins with II, 295, 19, Dindorf and ends with II, 397, 3. Its last sentence reads as follows: ἐξῆν γὰρ ὡς γενναῖε καὶ τὸν νέον δικαῖος εἶναι προτρέπειν καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις τὰ πρέποντ' ἀποδοῦναι· καὶ γὰρ εἰ μηδὲν εἴχομεν ἐπαινεῖν αὐτούς, ἀλλ' ἐξῆν γε δήπον παρελθεῖν σιωπῆ, καὶ οὐκ ἔμελλες ὄφλησεν ἀλογίουν. After these words we expect the epilogue of the whole discourse. Instead of concluding, however, Aristeides turns to a long and ardent invective against

¹ A new comprehensive edition of these scholia is much to be desired.

² W. Frommel, *Scholia in Aelii Aristidis sophistae orationes Panathenaicam et Platonicas* (Frankfurt, 1826).

³ *Aristides*, ed. W. Dindorf, Vol. III (Leipzig, 1829).

certain enemies concerning whom we need not and cannot go into details here. At first glance the connection of this invective with the preceding section of the discourse seems to be loose and accidental,⁴ although in a deeper sense and from the point of view of the purpose and tendency of the whole long treatise the continuity is not interrupted. A detailed analysis of the invective would lead even to the insight that it is no less essential than all the previous paragraphs for determining Aristeides' own position in the contemporary battle between philosophy and rhetoric. The most striking difference between these early paragraphs and the invective is the fact that Aristeides changes his style of polemics in railing at his anonymous opponents, who pretend they are Plato's allies and supporters. He uses an abundance of hardly comprehensible allusions which probably were more intelligible to his public than they are to us since we are ignorant of many of the references implied.

The external link between the last two sections of the discourse is the following: Plato proud of his greatness had a strong feeling of his own preëminent position among his contemporaries which also placed him above the patriots of previous periods. He, therefore, severely criticized other great Athenians in spite of their generally recognized merits. It is, however (Aristeides goes on), not so much Plato's attitude that causes me to be angry and indignant, although I cannot take it calmly, as the shameless behavior of some absolutely good-for-nothing fellows (*τῶν κομιδῆ τινες οὐδενὸς ἀξίων*) who ventured to belittle and slander the godlike Demosthenes, the peerless master of all rhetoricians. It is perhaps not accidental that just as Aristeides characterizes and criticizes his pseudo-philosophic adversaries, so does the emperor Julian, a couple of centuries after, in his anticyanic discourses attack his opponents among the so-called Cynicists or rather pseudo-Cynic philosophers. The resemblance between the words of Julian and those of Aristeides is sometimes so striking that one can scarcely help thinking that Julian bore the passage of Aristeides well in mind when he composed his invectives. Aristeides finds in these good-for-nothing fellows no less than four main moral defects for which he scornfully criti-

⁴ Nevertheless Dindorf does not even set it off in his text by a paragraph.

cizes them in order to convince the audience that they are really vile and wicked.⁵ Their alleged misbehavior must be examined very carefully. First, in contrast with living men (*εἰς ζῶντας τελῶν*), he says they walk around like ghosts of dead men (*βροτῶν ἄεδωλα καρόντων*). This is a literal quotation from Homer.⁶ Secondly, they are like *Ἡσιόδου κηφήνες*. This refers to Hesiod's *Works and Days* (line 302), where we also meet with the plural in the form *κηφήνεσσι*. The comparison means that they are not fond of working but of appropriating to themselves the earnings of other painstaking people. Up to this point everything is clear and easy to understand. This, however, cannot be said about Aristeides' discussion of their third defect. Following the text in Dindorf's edition, they are *Ἄρχιλόχου πίθηκοι, δύο μορφὰς ἔχοντες ἀντὶ τριῶν, τῆς τραγικῆς βοὸς τῶν ἴματίων τῶν ἡπημένων οὐδὲν διαφέροντες*. This seems to be entirely absurd, for as it stands now, we must ask what is the relationship between the tragic cow and patched garments? I do not see any possibility of finding a satisfactory answer to this question. It will be necessary, rather, to eliminate the comma between *τριῶν* and *τῆς*, which was suggested by Reiske and adopted by Dindorf, and put it between *βοὸς* and *τῶν ἴματίων*. This change of punctuation is a decisive step. Let us bear in mind that Aristeides clearly refers to Homer and Hesiod, to the former by giving a well-known quotation, to the latter by mentioning his name. Now if he refers to monkeys (in the plural) of Archilochus and to a single tragic cow, analogy suggests that Aristeides is no less exact in these two cases than in his references to Homer and Hesiod, and that his use of a plural or a singular has a special purpose even if we do not understand it at first glance. If the plural *πίθηκοι* means what it says we can no longer hold the view that *πίθηκοι* is a generalization or a pluralization which does not correspond to anything in Archilochus. Nor shall we agree with Reiske who, feeling unable otherwise to interpret the passage satisfactorily, changed the tragic cow to a cow in the comedy. In order to justify this conjecture, which cannot be counted among the

⁵ II, 398, 8 ff., ed. Dindorf.

⁶ *Odyssey*, XI, 476. I disagree with A. Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au II^e siècle de notre ère* (Paris, 1923), p. 250, n. 2, who refers to Homer, Ψ 72, where *βροτῶν* does not occur.

many *coniecturae palmares* in his notes on Aristeides, and in order to explain his senseless punctuation mentioned above, Reiske took refuge in the strange and groundless interpretation not only that "in nescio qua comoedia" there came upon the stage a cow which wore a cloth consisting of many colored rags sewed together, but that Archilochus in one of his poems introduced three-colored monkeys which Aristeides changed to two-colored ones because he wished to compare to them those good-for-nothing fellows at whom he scoffed. This interpretation is sheer fantasy and gives no answer to the main question: why did Aristeides in criticizing his opponents refer to the monkeys of Archilochus?

The most characteristic quality of monkeys, emphasized in world literature and in popular opinion, is their talent to imitate man or to make mischief. It is, therefore, a probable hypothesis that in referring to the monkeys of Archilochus Aristeides wishes to recall either one or both of these qualities, and that he reproaches his opponents either with imitating Plato in an objectionable way or, by their mischief, with causing damage to the authority of Plato and Demosthenes and, since he is convinced that he alone is Demosthenes' peer and successor, also to his own. The study of the scholia gives evidence that the first alternative is unconvincing and that only the second enables us to understand Aristeides' words. Only with it shall we learn how much Aristeides is personally involved in this controversy.

Boulanger pointed out⁷ that references to monkeys in two fragments of Archilochus offer little help in understanding the real meaning of Aristeides' words, and he gave up any attempt to interpret the passage, adding: "mais il n'y a là rien qui permette d'expliquer l'allusion d'Aristide. L'explication du scholiaste: "parce que le singe est un animal imitateur; ces gens imitent les philosophes et ne le sont pas" est évidemment inventée pour les besoins de la cause." With the tragic cow, however, Boulanger was on the right track.⁸ Yet though he had recourse to the scholia he could not make any decisive progress because the material available to him was too restricted. Only a closer examination of the restored scholia, therefore, can enable us to attain a more trustworthy and more distinct result.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 250, n. 4.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 251, n. 1.

The mythographical sources inform us of two cows in tragedy. One of them is Io. Since it is impossible to adapt to the myth of Io the concept of the three changing shapes or colors we must eliminate this story without further consideration. We have, therefore, to take into account solely the second cow which plays a part in one of the myths connected with the soothsayer Polyidus. One scholium on Aristeides refers also to that myth. In Dindorf's compilation it is in such bad condition that it makes no sense;⁹ in Frommel's edition it is in somewhat better shape but still far from being correct. For the sake of greater clarity the investigation will have to start not from this scholium but from the one preceding it. Since the manuscripts which were used by Reiske-Dindorf and Frommel are unreliable, the attempt at an analysis must be based upon three other manuscripts: *v* = Vat. gr. 76; *R* = Vat. gr. 1298; *Ambr.* = Ambr. A 175 sup., with which I have dealt at length in the third chapter of my *Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidescholien*.¹⁰ I frankly admit that this basis is not very solid because the leading manuscript with scholia, *M* (Marc. gr. 423) does not contain the section of the discourse in question and because other reliable sources are not known to exist.

The lemma *πιθηκοι* is identical in all three manuscripts. The scholium itself reads as follows: ἐπειδὴ μιμητικὸν τὸ ζῷον (*R*, *Ambr.*), μιμηλὸν γὰρ τὸ ζῷον (*v*; although *μιμηλόν* is a very attractive variant I suspect that this version is one of those many autoschediasmata of which there are many in manuscript *v*).¹¹ For the sense it makes no difference which variant we prefer) μιμοῦνται δὲ (*v*, *R*; δὲ is omitted in *Ambr.*) καὶ οὗτοι φιλοσόφοις, μὴ ὅντες φιλόσοφοι. It must be emphasized that the scholiast does not refer to Archilochus. This seems strange, for it is highly probable that the original scholiast mentioned him. Then follows the lemma δύο μορφὰς ἔχοντες which is identical again in the three manuscripts with a new scholium which reads as follows: (ἀντὶ τοῦ, *v*; omitted in *R*, *Ambr.*) πανοῦργοι καὶ ποκίλοι. ἡ δὲ ἱστορία αὐτη (*R*, *Ambr.*; τοιαύτη *v*). Πολύεδος (*πολυειδὲς* *v*, *R*; -δῆς *Ambr.* Whether we prefer the spelling of the proper name

⁹ III, 728, 31 ff.

¹⁰ *Problemata*, VIII (Berlin, 1934), pp. 29 ff.

¹¹ Cf. Lenz, *op. cit.*

with *ει* or *ι* is irrelevant since both forms were pronounced by the scholiast in the same way) *πεποίηται δρᾶμα Εὐριπίδη* (*R*; *εὐριπιδ Ambr.*, which probably means the dative; -δης *v*), *ἐν φιβοῦ τρίχρωμον* (*v, R*; *τρίχρονον Ambr.*) *ποιεῖ* (*v, R*; -εῖν *Ambr.*) *εὐρῆσθαι*, *περὶ οὐ γέγονεν αὐτοῖς φιλονεκία βασιλείας*. 'δύο' δὲ 'μορφὰς' εἶπεν 'ἀντὶ τριῶν' (*R, Ambr.*; ἀντὶ τοῦ γ *v*) ὡς ἐξισαζονσῶν τῶν δύο ταῖς τρισί. τὸ δὲ διάφορον τῆς μορφῆς δηλοῖ τὸ ποικίλον τῆς γνώμης αὐτῶν.

As this scholium now stands it is unintelligible. Who are the people who are introduced as fighting for royal dignity? To whom or to what matter do the words *περὶ οὐ* refer? Intense study of the scholia has led me again and again in similar cases to the same result: scholia of this type, which present at their beginning a brief linguistic explanation of one or more words used by the author (in our case *πανοῦργοι καὶ ποικίλοι*; the additional words in *v ἀντὶ τοῦ* are very characteristic of this kind of explication), which make in the second place a comment upon the subject discussed by the author (here η δὲ *ιστορία . . . βασιλείας*), and which finally, after a literal quotation from the passage in question, add another exegetical note (here 'δύο' δὲ 'μορφὰς' . . . *αντῶν*), have always lost their original shape and are the product of a retouching redactor. They were composed, or rather welded together, of a certain number of separate scholia —sometimes two, sometimes three, sometimes even more. The seam, accordingly, along which we must take them apart, if we wish to understand their structure and restore them as far as possible, was usually marked by one or more appearances of the particle δέ which must be attributed to the redactor who connected the original scholia. Analysis of the scholia of this type leads also to the further important discovery that in most cases the more recent compiler did not preserve scrupulously the original order of the scholia but adapted it to his purposes. This method is in harmony with the general tendency of the more recent periods of antiquity to select from, and to epitomize, the large amount of learned material which the original scholiasts had collected. This procedure caused considerable damage in the great majority of cases.

This observation is of fundamental importance for any future editor of the scholia. Its validity is confirmed again and again

by the leading manuscript *M* when its version of the scholia is compared with the scholia in *R* and *Ambr*. The practice of *v*, however, is not consistent, inasmuch as it agrees in one passage with *M*, in another with *R, Ambr*.¹²

I have already indicated by underlining $\delta\acute{e}$ in the text of the scholium (see above, pp. 39-40) that the words $\dot{\eta}\ i\sigma\tau\acute{o}\acute{p}\acute{a}$ and $\delta\acute{o}\ \mu\sigma\phi\grave{a}\grave{s}$ were the opening words of two originally separate scholia, and I think that the author of this group of scholia started his interpretation of the difficult passage by discussing the subject matter treated by Aristeides, and that in so doing he quoted the words $\delta\acute{o}\ \mu\sigma\phi\grave{a}\grave{s}\ \grave{a}\nu\tau\grave{t}\iota\ \tau\mu\grave{w}\acute{o}\acute{v}$. Then we must consider the words $\delta\acute{o}\ \mu\sigma\phi\grave{a}\grave{s}$ (without $\delta\acute{e}$ between them) . . . $\grave{a}\nu\tau\grave{w}\acute{o}\acute{v}$ the remains of the first original scholium. In it the words $\tau\grave{o}\ \grave{d}\grave{e}\ \delta\acute{a}\phi\grave{o}\acute{p}\acute{o}\acute{v}\ .\ .\ .\ \grave{a}\nu\tau\grave{w}\acute{o}\acute{v}$ appropriately explain the expression $\tau\acute{w}\acute{o}\ \acute{i}\mu\acute{a}\tau\acute{w}\acute{o}\ \tau\acute{w}\acute{o}\ \dot{\eta}\pi\acute{p}\mu\acute{e}\acute{w}\acute{o}\ \acute{o}\grave{u}\grave{d}\grave{e}\grave{v}\ \grave{\delta}\grave{a}\phi\acute{e}\acute{r}\grave{o}\acute{v}\grave{t}\acute{e}\acute{s}$ which follows immediately in Aristeides. These words taken together with the end of the sentence mean "they do not at all differ from patched garments, the exterior becoming and imposing, but within—what their interior looks like—well, let someone else say" (i. e., vile and worthless).¹³ This section of the sentence is certainly not an additional quotation from any other author, in line with the four preceding quotations from, or references to, Homer, Hesiod, Archilochus, and Euripides. Aristeides wishes to make it clear why he is right in referring to the colored cow. In order to understand this better we must now turn back to the beginning of the scholium, which, as I have said above, was not the beginning of the original group of scholia. As it stands now it makes no sense. Apparently it was seriously damaged before it came down to us. The words $\dot{\eta}\ i\sigma\tau\acute{o}\acute{p}\acute{a}\ \grave{a}\nu\tau\acute{t}\iota\acute{h}$ (or $\tau\acute{o}\acute{u}\acute{a}\nu\acute{t}\iota\acute{h}$) give a strong indication that a detailed report on the *Polyidus* of Euripides had been made by the first scholiast. He had to inform the user of his exegetical notes where the three-colored cow was to be "found," for as it stands now no reader is able to understand what part was played by the cow

¹² Incidentally, it may not be useless to emphasize that *R* and *Ambr* do not offer everywhere identical versions of the retouched scholia but sometimes differ considerably. In the case which is now under examination, however, this is quite unimportant.

¹³ It is surprising that Reiske, who thinks that the Greek text is corrupt and cannot be adequately understood, is entirely wrong in this passage.

or what the meaning of the three colors was, unless he consults other mythographical sources. Instead of receiving this necessary information we read the strange relative clause *περὶ οὗ γέγονεν αὐτοῖς φιλονεκία βασιλείας*. Now we know that when the soothsayer Polyidus met king Minos of Crete, the owner of the three-colored cow, the king was not afraid of any rival. The two authorities which are available for this story, Pseudo-Apollodorus, III, 3, 1 and Hyginus, *Fabulae*, 136, do not touch on the question. The immediate consequence of this insufficient information which we receive from the scholium in its present shape is that the pronoun *αὐτοῖς* has no reference, nor is there any noun or other word to which the masculine or neuter relative pronoun *οὗ* could refer. On the other hand, the first scholiast certainly was not careless enough to change the cow to an ox and connect *οὗ* with *βοός*. This is a chain of problems and doubts which prevent us from understanding or emending the scholium without references to other passages.

The only scholar who took pains to ponder all these difficulties was Valckenaer.¹⁴ His solution is, however, only in part satisfactory. He bracketed the unintelligible relative clause and considered it an interpolation based upon some confusion with the myth of Pelops who had in his stable a golden ram. Valckenaer's suggestion that the relative clause be eliminated is right, although it is not an interpolation; his explanation, however, is erroneous. The hypothesis that an interpolation of this kind was made in a scholium is highly improbable in itself. There is, however, another possibility to which no one has paid attention up to the present time. We are told by the scholiast that, in connection with some matter of which we know nothing, some undefined persons have an argument or a fight over the royal throne. Immediately before the passage on which the scholiast comments in this way we read in Aristeides the reference to the monkeys of Archilochus which has no echo in the present scholia. Now, among the fables of Aesop there is one which gives decisive help.¹⁵ The subject of this fable is a controversy between the elephant and the camel. Because of their height (*διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ σώματος*) and bodily strength (*ἰσχὺν*, which is truer of the elephant, whereas

¹⁴ L. K. Valckenaer, *Diatribes*, p. 201.

¹⁵ 183, Halm = 146, Chambry: Budé edition.

the quality of height is true of both of them) both animals make a claim to the position of king before the tribunal of the other animals. Neither of them is willing to yield, until the monkey as mischiefmaker intervenes and succeeds by clever arguments in cheating and turning down both the pretenders and in frustrating their efforts. The opening words of this story read as follows: *τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων βουλευομένων βασιλέα ἐλέσθαι κάμηλος καὶ ἐλέφας ἐφιλονείκουν*. It is hardly only a mere coincidence that the keywords *φιλονεικία βασιλείας* also occur in that relative clause *περὶ οὐ γέγονεν αὐτοῖς φιλονεικία βασιλείας*, which makes no sense in its present context. This relative clause is the only surviving fragment of a lost scholium in which was discussed the part played by the monkey in the argument between the elephant and the camel and in which a reference was made to Archilochus who was said to have composed an iambic poem, an *aīvos*, in which he dealt with this subject. The scholiast, who did not know how to handle the fragment, inserted it to the best of his ability into the following scholium which discussed the colored cow.

If this explanation of the mysterious *āvtōis* in the scholium on Aristeides in particular and of the whole relative clause in general is accepted the scholium begins to make excellent sense. The words *περὶ οὐ*, however, remain somewhat difficult because we cannot restore the exact words of the lost sentence or sentences which contained the report on the fight between elephant and camel and the ultimate triumph of the monkey. The only thing we can do is to ponder two possible surmises. One of them is that *οὐ* looks back or refers to a preceding noun like *μέγεθος*, which meant the height of the two main competitors which gave them a just claim to rulership over the other animals. The second alternative explains the relative pronoun *οὐ* differently. It cannot be flatly denied that the two words *περὶ οὐ*, instead of having been written by the earlier scholiast, go back to the compiler who made one scholium out of a group of at least three and probably, if our interpretation holds good, of four scholia. In order to insert¹⁶ the preserved obscure fragment of the lost report on the fable and on the poem of Archilochus he added the two words *περὶ οὐ* which now refer to *βοός*. He did that in

¹⁶ An analogous case in another scholium will be discussed in the Appendix.

a very careless and thoughtless manner because he overlooked that Aristeides, in accordance with the mythographical tradition, had been referring to a cow. This example of his carelessness is by no means unprecedented in those scholia which careful analysis can trace back to their original form, or which can be compared with the better version of the manuscript *M*.

This interpretation restores to the relative clause its right to existence and identifies, at the same time, one of the monkeys of Archilochus. The question of the plural *πίθηκοι* which was used by Aristeides still remains. Hyginus tells us in the passage of his *Fabulae* mentioned above¹⁷ that the cow changed its colors every four hours from white to red, from red to black, and—we must supply—from black to white again. Since Aristeides had no use for the red color of the cow he had to adjust the story to his own purpose. Therefore, he does not say that the opponents have several different colors which they change incessantly, but asserts that they have two “shapes” instead of the three¹⁸ “colors”—we must assume—of the cow in the tragedy. That this is his real intention he makes perfectly clear by means of the comparison with the patched garments and of the additional remark *τὰ μὲν ἔξω σεμνοί, τὰ δὲ ἔνδον ἄλλος ἀν εἰδείν τις* which I have discussed above. Now it becomes evident that we must understand this not only as “becoming and imposing without” and “soiled within,” as I have said above, but also as “white” and “black.”

¹⁷ See p. 42, *supra*.

¹⁸ It appears that O. Crusius’ suggestion (*Rh. Mus.*, XLIX [1894], pp. 305 f.) *ἀντὶ τριῶν* instead of *ἀντὶ τριῶν* and his interpretation of the passage must be rejected. Both of them are based upon Reiske’s unfortunate idea that the words *δύο μορφὰς ἔχοντες ἀντὶ τριῶν* refer to the monkeys of Archilochus instead of to the cow in the tragedy. Boulanger, *op. cit.*, pp. 250 f., n. 4, was right in disagreeing with Crusius; he did not, however, know how to replace the conjecture with which he was not pleased by any other convincing emendation, nor did he make any attempt at a satisfactory interpretation. We must, however, consider seriously another suggestion which was made by B. Keil in a marginal note in his copy of Dindorf’s edition. Keil inserts *⟨τῶν⟩* between *ἀντὶ* and *τριῶν*. Although I admit that this is a simple and attractive suggestion, I hesitate to accept it because I think rather that Aristeides deliberately wrote *δύο μορφὰς ἔχοντες ἀντὶ τριῶν* and did not use the article because he wished to emphasize the contrast more pointedly.

I have not examined as yet the very first words of the scholium (*ἀντὶ τοῦ ν*) *πανοῦργοι καὶ ποικίλοι*. What is their special purpose? The last words of that section of the scholium which has appeared to be the first of the original group of scholia are *τὸ ποικίλον τῆς γνώμης αὐτῶν*. The fact that the adjective *ποικίλος* is in best harmony with, and completely adequate to, the comparison with the colored cow prevents us from believing, unless we admit a senseless repetition, that the first words (*ἀντὶ τοῦ*) *πανοῦργοι καὶ ποικίλοι* had originally anything to do with the scholium which discusses the cow in the tragedy. The adjective *πανοῦργοι* is just as inappropriate to the cow as it is appropriate to the monkeys as mischiefmakers. We must, therefore, infer that the first part of the present scholium originally belonged to an explanation which referred to *πίθηκοι* and was erroneously and clumsily connected with the following scholium by means of the typical δέ. After this connection was made, the noun *πίθηκοι* now lacked any scholium at all. Therefore another scholium was added without real content: *ἐπειδὴ μυμητικὸν τὸ ζῷον*, etc. Boulanger is quite right in saying that it was invented "pour les besoins de la cause." Our analysis, however, has proved that the first scholiast worked much more conscientiously, explaining not only the comparison between Aristeides' opponents and monkeys but also commenting on the reference to Archilochus.

Many decades ago Theodor Bergk came to the conviction that we must take into serious account the possibility that Archilochus had composed not only one but several *aἶνοι* about monkeys. Bergk's points of view were approved by O. Immisch.¹⁹ He convincingly refuted the unsuccessful attempt to reconstruct Archilochus' poem made by S. Luria,²⁰ although in his polemic he did not lay great stress on the plural *πίθηκοι* used by Aristeides and assumed by the scholiast, probably because he, too, knew at least two poems of Archilochus about monkeys as mischiefmakers, not merely the one about the fight between the elephant and the camel. Unfortunately we are not in position to find out whether Archilochus, frag. 81, Diehl, which deals with a monkey, belongs to the second poem referred to by Aristeides. This fragment was

¹⁹ "Ein Epodos des Archilochos," *Sitz. Heidelb. Akad.*, 1930-1931, no. 3, p. 7.

²⁰ *Philol.*, LXXXV (1930), pp. 1 ff.

taken from an *airos* but is too brief and too vague to enable us to see whether the monkey had any opportunity during his conversation with the fox to display *πανοργία* and *ποικιλία*, or was defeated by the superior cleverness of the fox. Although Immisch is inclined to prefer the first alternative and to think that the monkey was ultimately triumphant, the possibility cannot be denied that Aristeides as well as the scholiast had knowledge of another poem of Archilochus that is entirely unknown to us. However that may be, it does not affect the unequivocal result of our inquiry into the structure of the scholium, and our better understanding of a seemingly hopeless passage of Aristeides.

It is quite a different question who were the opponents whom Aristeides attacked so furiously. A satisfactory answer can be given, if at all, only after a careful and detailed interpretation of the whole last section of the discourse 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων. I should like to emphasize again that a systematic comparison between Aristeides and the anticynic discourses of the emperor Julian might afford some valuable help in attaining this goal. It has been within the scope of this paper only to discuss a limited problem.

APPENDIX ²¹

An analogous analytical interpretation throws some light upon another scholium that has defied so far all attempts to understand the intention of its author. Although the subject which is discussed has nothing in common with the main problem of my investigation, the case imparts so much information on the general method to be followed in handling the scholia that I wish to present my solution of a seemingly hopeless problem.

In a famous passage of his *Gorgias* (515 E) Plato criticizes Pericles for having made the Athenians covetous and avaricious. Aristeides is very angry at this reproach, which he considers unjustified and almost malicious.²² Even before he starts his systematic refutation of Plato's criticism we read the following words (II, 195, 15-196, 1):

Περικλῆς τοίνυν οὐκ αὐτὸς κοψάμενος νόμισμα, ἀλλ' ὄντων ἐν ἀκροπόλει

²¹ See p. 43, n. 16, *supra*.

²² 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων, II, 197, 7 ff., ed. Dindorf.

χρημάτων, ἐκεῖθεν ἔσωζε²³ τὸν μισθόν. ὥστ' οὐδετέρου δίκαιος ἔχειν αἰτίαν, οὐτε τοῦ νομίσματος οὐτε τοῦ μισθοῦ. καὶ τί ταῦτα ἀγωνίζομαι σφόδρα; εἰ γὰρ ὡς οἰόν τε μάλιστα αἰσχρὸν ἡ μισθοφορὰ καὶ τὸ νέμειν, οὐ τῆς Περικλέους ἐστὶ πολιτείας οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκείνου χρόνων ἥρξατο, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν νομοθετῶν τις ἥδει ταῦτα.

Two scholia comment on this passage, III, 506, 14-16 and 17-21, Dindorf. The former of them refers to the beginning of the words which I have just quoted, Περικλῆς τοίνυν οὐκ αὐτὸς κοψάμενος νόμισμα, the second illustrates the end of the sentence οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκείνου χρόνων ἥρξατο, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν νομοθετῶν τις ἥδει ταῦτα. Fortunately the leading manuscript *M* is also here available. From it we learn that the second scholium consists of two originally separate scholia made into one in the manuscripts *v*, *R*, and *Ambr.*, which often disregarded the intention of the scholiast. In examining the three scholia we must bear in mind that the central section of the whole paragraph is without any scholium. The three scholia, the text of which must be based upon *M*, read as follows:

- (1) μεταστατικὸν πάλιν τὸ σχῆμα τῆς ἀπολογίας· μεταφέρει γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ νόμισμα καὶ τὸν Σόλωνα τὴν αἰτίαν.
- (2) τῷ χρόνῳ πάλιν λύει τὸ ἔγκλημα.
- (3) τὸ τῶν νομοθετῶν ὄνομα σεμνὸν δὲ λέγει. ἐμφαίνει δὲ τὸν Σόλωνα ἡ πολιοῦχον. οὗτος γὰρ ἔταξε καὶ βουλευτικὸν μισθὸν καὶ δικαστικόν. αἰνίττεται δὲ καὶ εἰς Πλάτωνα. διὸ καὶ ἀορίστως εἶπεν.

I feel free to neglect some unimportant variants which are of no value for the main problem, and restrict myself to noting that *M* is the only manuscript that has the correct form δικαστικόν, whereas *v* has διδασκαλικόν and *R* and *Ambr.* have διδακτικόν. It is Aristeides' aim to exonerate Pericles from blame and charge the era prior to Pericles with creating the custom of μισθοφορά. The scholiast refers to Solon as the originator of this institution. The first and second scholia are intelligible without further comment. The situation in the third scholium, however, is

²³ At first glance ἔσωζε seems strange, and the reader might expect παρεῖχε or something similar. It is, however, correct and means: he kept the custom of distributing μισθός which he had not introduced; he neither discontinued nor abolished it.

different. Here the two words $\eta\piολιοῦχον$ after $\Sigmaόλωνα$ are quite obscure. They are found in all the manuscripts and also occur in the scholia of the more recent Sopater version.²⁴ The only scholar, so far as I know, who attempted to interpret these two words was U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff,²⁵ whereas Frommel in his edition of the scholia (p. 192) contented himself with adding after $\Piολιοῦχον$, which he had printed with capital Π, the word (sic), which means nothing.

Wilamowitz's suggestion is less a real explanation than an hypothesis advanced not without scepticism. He begins with confessing that he feels unable to offer a convincing interpretation and does not venture to decide whether we should write $\piολιοῦχον$ or $\Piολιοῦχον$. He is, however, inclined to favor the second alternative and considers the possibility that $\Piολιοῦχον$ was corrupted from $\Piολίοχον$ and that Pericles might have used the services of a man whose name was $\Piολίοχος$ when he wished some motion concerning a new or modified settlement of salary to be carried. Wilamowitz himself has an important objection to his own hypothesis, in so far as he points out that it conflicts with the tendency of the scholiast to make Solon responsible also for introducing the democratic feature of $\muσθοφορά$ and to show that this custom was not created by Pericles but much earlier. This view is also held by scholium (2) in which the scholiast expressly says $\tauῷ χρόνῳ πάλιν λύει τὸ ἔγκλημα$. Under these circumstances it can hardly be believed that the scholiast should have referred, in addition to Solon, to another man who was a collaborator with, or mouthpiece of, Pericles. In so doing he would have destroyed or at least weakened the cogency of his own argument. But that is not all that speaks against Wilamowitz's suggestion. If the scholiast goes on $οὗτος γὰρ ἔταξε$ the pronoun $οὗτος$ makes no sense, unless we can assume that he did not refer to anyone but Solon. I fear that Wilamowitz's attempt at a solution leads to no result, and think rather that in this seemingly hopeless case there is but one solution of quite a different kind. Wilamowitz is doubtless right in denying that the two words $\eta\piολιοῦχον$ or $\Piολιοῦχον$ look like a stupid auto-

²⁴ III, 506, 23-25, ed. Dindorf. For the meaning of this term see Chap. V of my *Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidesscholien*.

²⁵ *Hermes*, LXII (1927), p. 294.

schediasma. Nor are they a mere interpolation to be eliminated as such. They remain incomprehensible as long as we read them in the midst of the surrounding sentences. They begin, however, to reveal a certain meaning as soon as we take them out of their context and consider them the remains of a lost scholium, preserved and inserted in the wrong place. We must remember that *πολιοῦχος* is an epithet of the goddess Athena and that in the same paragraph Aristeides tells us that public funds had been deposited in the Acropolis. Acropolis means in this case the temple of Athena. This was the appropriate place for the scholiast to remind the reader that the goddess who protected the public funds had this or that surname or the surname *πολιοῦχον* which may be written also with capital Π. If this proves true it becomes evident not only that the beginning and the end of the paragraph were equipped with scholia but also that there were scholia on the central section, which now, surprisingly enough, has no exegetical note in the scholia which are available to us.*

FRIEDRICH WALTER LENZ.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

* The research embodied in this article was made possible by the support of the American Philosophical Society.

THE TEXT AND INTERPRETATION OF THE THEODOSIAN CODE, 6, 4, 21.¹

The text of this constitution is transmitted by a single manuscript, *Parisiensis Latinus* 9643, at last accounts in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Mommsen and Krueger denote it by R and this is the usually accepted designation, though Haenel calls it *Codex Lugdunensis* or simply *Codex*, and Gothofredus refers to it simply as MS, since it is the only manuscript for this part of the Code. Mommsen² has given an inadequate description of this manuscript, with its history so far as known and with bibliographical references. It is written in beautiful uncials of the latter part of the fifth or the early part of the sixth century. The script is so clear that there is general agreement on all its readings that have been preserved without damage. It contains books 6-8 of the Theodosian Code almost entire and it is the sole witness for most of this part of the Code. It is exceptionally reliable throughout and its trustworthiness is so well established that no editor is justified in resorting to con-

¹ The editions of the Theodosian Code cited in this article are: Iacobus Cujacius (Cujas), *Codex Theodosianus* (Lugdunum, 1566; 2d ed., Paris and Geneva, 1586); Iacobus Gothofredus (Godefroy), *Codex Theodosianus* (Lugdunum, 1665, 2d ed. by Jo. Dan. Ritter, Leipsic, 1736-1745); Gustavus Haenel, *Codex Theodosianus* (Bonn, 1837-1842); Theodorus Mommsen, *Theodosiani Libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis, adsumpto apparatu P. Kruegeri* (Berlin, 1905); P. Krueger, *Codex Theodosianus*, I-VIII (Berlin, 1923-1926). A full list of other editions may be found in Mommsen, *op. cit.*, pp. cvii-cxviii. None of these other editions has added anything to the discussions of Cujas, Godefroy, Krueger, and Mommsen in their treatment of the text of this passage. The standard text is that of Mommsen, based on the compilations of Krueger, extending over many years, and completed in Mommsen's last years, when he was very old, and published posthumously. This edition, with its full critical apparatus, is indispensable, though Mommsen treats the manuscript tradition with too much freedom and often rewrites the text, apparently in conformity with some preconceived theory. Krueger's edition is marred by many defects, including numerous typographical errors, since it was prepared and issued in his extreme old age and broken off at the end of the eighth book by his death. Yet it is superior in many respects to the text of Mommsen, since Krueger holds much more closely to the manuscript tradition. The edition of Gothofredus, with its great commentary, is essential for any serious study of the Theodosian Code and the history of the later Roman empire.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. xxxviii-xli and cxix-clvi.

jectural emendation unless the text can be definitely proved to be corrupt. The burden of proof in every case must rest heavily upon the emender. Though the manuscript has many faults, most of them are orthographic and are characteristic of most manuscripts of its period. Practically all of these faults are insignificant and easily emendable by very slight and self-evident changes. A photostatic reproduction³ has been published in Paris. The passage here studied has thus far defied solution, although many attempts have been made to reconstruct the missing part and to emend the text further. A full page of this manuscript regularly has 30 lines, with 40 to 45 letters to the line. The required number of letters to the line is an important fact that seems to have been disregarded by the various editors who have sought to restore and emend this passage.

The following transcription of this part of the manuscript will fairly indicate the state of the text.

1. TEMPORE QUOTE MONARI IDESIGNA NURETIAM SO
2. NOMINATIO CELEBRETUR FIAT Q. CONVENTIO QUAM
3. FICIUM PU. CURARIO PORTETUTSIITARE EXPETIT
4. FICIIS PROVINCIA RUMAD PERVESTIGANDUM FIDE
5. UTI QUAM CONMODATU RIPSIPOTISSIMUM SUPER
6. SIGNATORUM NOMINIB. CONSULAMUS QUOMISSIS
7. STRENUIS OBLIGATIS Q. IUDICIB. NON MODOTEMONA
8. VERUM CONPLICES QUO Q. EORUM IN EXHIBITIONE MP
9. PRIMUNERIS SURGUEANTUR FINGAMUSE NI POS
10. FIERI UT DESIGNATI PRIMO ET SECUNDU VEL TERTIO AN
11. SUBTER FUGERE IN QUIRENTIUM SOLlicitUDIN EPOS
12. CERTE SEPTEM RELIQUIS HAUT DUBIA E POTES TREP
13. RIDENIQ. UTPRIUS STATUIM USEORUM QUI PER ANN
14. GULOSA DCANDIDATUM ATQ. HONORE SCERTOS NO
15. TURIN SCIENTIA MNO STRAM POST DESIGNATIO
16. BITAMIN SINUATIONE FIDA VOCABULA DEFERANT

³ *Code Théodosien, Livres vi-viii* (Paris, Imprimerie Berthaud Frères, n. d.).

The manuscript is of parchment and measures 275 by 222 millimeters. Some of the leaves have been lost and the manuscript today has only 122 folios. The first few and the last few pages have been mutilated by erosion, caused by dampness. The manuscript has undergone slight additional losses since the time of Cujas who used it for his edition of the Theodosian Code published at Lyons in 1566. Cujas has transmitted a number of readings no longer legible but in some cases where the script had been defaced he misread the manuscript.

The passage may be divided into words as follows:

1. Tempore quo temonarii designantur etiam so . . .
2. nominatio celebretur fiatq. conventio quam . . .
3. ficum PU. curari oportet, ut si ita res expetit . . .
4. ficiis provinciarum ad pervestigandum fide . . .
5. utiquam conmodatur, ipsi potissimum super . . .
6. signatorum nominib. consulamus, quo missis . . .
7. strenuis obligatisq. iudicib. non modo temona . . .
8. verum complices quoq. eorum in exhibitionem p . . .
9. prii muneric urgueantur. Fingamus enim pos . . .
10. fieri ut designati primo et secundo vel tertio an . . .
11. subterfugere inquirentium sollicitudinem pos . . .
12. certe septem reliquis haut dubiae poterunt rep . . .
13. ri. Deniq. ut prius statuimus, eorum qui per ann . . .
14. gulos ad candidatum atq. honores certos no . . .
15. tur, in scientiam nostram post designatio . . .
16. bitam insinuatione fida vocabula deferant . . .

Gothofredus⁴ emends and restores the passage as follows:

1. Tempore quo telonarii designantur, etiams(i) 37 letters
2. nominatio celebretur fiatq(ue) conventio, quam (of-) 39 letters
3. ficum PU. curare oportet et si ita res expetit (of-) 40 letters
4. ficii provinciarum ad pervestigandum fid(e) 37 letters
5. uti quam commoda, tamen ipsi potissimum super (de-) 40 letters
6. signatorum nominib(us) consulamus, quo missis (a me) 39 letters
7. strenuis ablegatisq(ue) indicib(us), non modo telona(rios) 42 letters
8. verum complices quoq(ue) eorum in exhibitionem p(ro-) 40 letters
9. prii muneric urgueamus.

Notes:

1. vel telotharii, vel remotarii, vel remorarii
7. revised to iudicibus by Ritter
vel telotharios, vel remotarios, vel remorarios

Haenel⁵ thus restores and emends the passage:

1. Tempore quo temonarii designantur, etiams(i) 37 letters
2. nominatio celebretur fiatq(ue) conventio quam (of-) 39 letters
3. ficum PU. curare oportet, et, si ita res expetit (of-) 40 letters
4. ficiis provinciarum ad pervestigandum fid(e) 38 letters
5. uti quam conmodatur, ipsi potissimum super (de-) 38 letters
6. signatorum nominib(us) consulamus, quo missis 36 letters
7. strenuis obligatisq(ue) iudicib(us) non modo temona(rii) 41 letters
8. verum complices quoq(ue) eorum in exhibitionem p(ro-) 40 letters
9. prii muneric urgueantur.

Notes:

5. An leg. commodat, id est, officium provinciarum uti oportet ad pervestigandum ea fide quam ipsum co.nmodat?

⁴ *Op. cit.*, II, pp. 57-60.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 524-6.

With fine disregard of the manuscript requirements, Mommsen⁶ reads:

1. Tempore quo te^{monarii} designantur etiam so***** 37 (42) letters
2. nominatio celebretur fiatq(ue) conventio quam (per of-) 37 letters
3. ficiales PU. curari oportet, ut si ita res expetit (omissis of-) 49 letters
4. ficiais provinciarum ad p^{er}vestigandum fide(liore possis) 49 letters
5. uti quam commodato. Ipsi potissimum super (de-) 37 letters
6. signatorum nominib(us) consulamur, quo missis (viris) 41 letters
7. strenuis obligatisq(ue) iudicib(us) non modo temona(rii) 41 letters
8. verum complices quoq(ue) eorum in exhibitionem p(ro-) 40 letters
9. prii muneric urg^{ue}antur.

Notes:

1. so(lita) Seeck.
3. omissis in text: remotis in notes.
6. missis (illuc) Vesme.

The text can be restored very easily and satisfactorily, in accordance with a few elementary principles of text criticism:

1. Follow the manuscript evidence faithfully, as far as it exists.
2. Do not resort to emendations of presumptively sound text to support hypothetical restorations of the lost part.
3. Employ no restoration that violates the manuscript evidence by making any line excessively long (more than 45 letters in length) or excessively short (less than 40 letters).
4. Adopt the usually accepted restorations of lines 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, by restoring: so(ciorum) in line 1, and (per of-) in line 2, with Vesme, by accepting the self-evident restorations (of-) of line 3, temona(rii) of line 7, (pro-) of line 8, an(no) of line 10, pos(sint) of line 11, rep(eri-) of line 12, ann(os sin-) of line 13, no(minan-) of line 14, designatio(nem de-) of line 15, and deferant(ur. Idem) of line 16. Mommsen's restoration (viris) of line 6 may be accepted without materially changing the meaning, and this line is short (38 letters) without the addition of some word. In line 5 the restoration of (de-) is self-evident and is adopted by all editors, none of whom makes any suggestion for the necessary addition of not less than 2 letters and not more than 7 letters, to prevent the line from being excessively long or unduly short. Apparently no significant word has been lost and we should either print (. . . de-) or, better still, supply some such word as *horum* which slightly

⁶ Op. cit., p. 255.

helps the required meaning and makes a line of normal length. At the end of line 9 the editors agree on the restoration *pos(se)*. This makes a short line (38 letters) and we should either read *pos(se . . .)* or better still *pos(se illud)* which improves the expression and makes a line of normal length.

5. Restore (*et of-*) in line 3 and *fide(s ne-)* at the end of line 4. These restorations make perfect sense, give the meaning required by the context, and agree with all known facts about the Recruit Tax Collectors (*Temonarii*) and the conditions of the time (372 A. D.) when this Constitution was issued. It is remarkable how the restoration of these two short syllables, *et, ne-*, clarifies this whole passage and eliminates the necessity of any textual emendations. *Neutiquam*, which is here restored, is a comparatively rare Latin word and it is found in only two other Constitutions in the Theodosian Code.⁷ For whatever it may be worth, it may be observed that these two Constitutions were issued in the same period as this Constitution, one of them in 372, the same year as this Constitution, and by the same Emperors, Valentinian I, Valens, and Gratian. The other Constitution was issued only ten years later, in 382, by Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius.

The text of the first 16 lines,⁸ as restored, would then read:

1. *Tempore quo temonarii designantur etiam so(ciorum)* 43 letters
2. *nominatio celebretur fiatq(ue) conventio quam (per of-)* 42 letters
3. *ficum PŪ. curari oportet, ut si ita res expetit (et of-)* 42 letters
4. *ficiis provinciarum ad pervestigandum fide(s ne-)* 41 letters
5. *utiquam conmodatur, ipsi potissimum super (horum de-)* 43 letters
6. *signatorum nominib(us) consulamus, quo missis (viris)* 41 letters
7. *strenuis obligatisq(ue) iudicib(us) non modo temona(rii)* 41 letters
8. *verum complices quoq(ue) eorum in exhibitionem p(ro-)* 40 letters
9. *prii muneric urgeantur. Fingamus enim pos(se illud)* 43 letters
10. *fieri ut designati primo et secundo vel tertio an(no)* 43 letters
11. *subterfugere inquirentium sollicitudinem pos(sint)* 45 letters
12. *certe septem reliquis haud dubie poterunt rep(eri-)* 43 letters
13. *ri. Deniq(ue) ut prius statuimus, eorum qui per ann(os sin-)* 42 letters
14. *gulos ad candidatum atq(ue) honores certos no(minan-)* 40 letters
15. *tur, in scientiam nostram post designatio(nem de-)* 40 letters
16. *bitam insinuatione fida vocabula deferant(ur. Idem)* 43 letters

⁷ These are 8, 7, 12, issued in 372, and 15, 2, 3, issued in 382.

⁸ Editors are in agreement as to the remaining restorations, since they are very slight and self-evident.

The passage may be translated as follows:

At the time when the Collectors of Recruit Taxes (*Temonarii*) are designated, also the nomination of their colleagues (substitutes) shall be formally made and they shall be officially notified, a task which is to be performed through the Office Staff of the Prefect of the City, so that if the situation should so require and if no confidence at all is placed in the Office Staffs of the Governors of the Provinces for tracking down these appointees, We Ourselves may rather take counsel regarding the names of the aforesaid appointees, in order that We may send strenuous men, bind the Governors to the performance of their duties, and compel not only the Collectors of Recruit Taxes but also their colleagues (accomplices) to the due performance of their public services (*munera*). For if we should suppose that this well known practice can take place, namely that the appointees may be able to elude the vigilance of the searchers for the first or second or even the third year, certainly within the remaining seven years without doubt it will be possible for them to be found.

Finally, as we have formerly established, in the case of those who are nominated to the office of Praetor (*candidatus*) and to those certain high honors for each separate year, after they have been duly designated, their names shall be reported to Our Omnipotence, with trustworthy information.

COMMENTARY

This constitution furnishes invaluable information on the Recruit Tax Collectors (*Temonarii*), about whom very little is known. The present state of information on this subject has been conveniently summed up by Kubitschek⁹ who cites the bibliography till 1934. Nothing of importance has appeared since.

From this constitution we may infer that with the appointment of the *Temonarii* to their obligatory state services or liturgies, apparently associates or substitutes (*socii*) were appointed at the same time. They were duly notified or subpoenaed through the Office Staff of the Prefect of the City. At this time the various subordinate officials comprising the Office Staffs of the Governors were notoriously corrupt, open to bribery, and untrustworthy in the performance of their ordinary duties. In order to notify provincial appointees of their election to the office of

⁹ R.-E., s. v. *Temonarius*.

Temonarius, the Prefect of the City would need to operate through the Governors and their Office Staffs. Since these Office Staffs and even the Governors themselves might easily be bribed to become the accomplices of the *Temonarii* elect, the emperor sought to make provision whereby he might intervene directly and compel the Governors and their Office Staffs to perform their required duties. The office of *Temonarius* was a burdensome and expensive compulsory public service or liturgy and most of the appointees did all they could to evade this task. From this constitution it appears that the *Temonarii* were either appointed ten years in advance of the time they were to take office,¹⁰ as was the custom in case of the Praetors,¹¹ or else they must serve for a period of ten years. The evidence is not adequate to make it possible to decide which of these alternatives was true. The office of *Temonarius* was an obligatory public service of the lower sort (*munus sordidum*).¹² It was not considered an honorable one and it conferred no title of nobility as did the high and honorable office of Praetor.

This constitution is addressed to the City Prefect Bappo,¹³ and the first part of it thus deals with the functions of the Office of the City Prefect in the official notification of the *Temonarii* of their appointment, with an indication of the part to be played by the Governors and their Office Staffs in the notification of appointees residing in the provinces. The second part, beginning with the words "Denique ut prius statuimus," line 13, deals with the appointment of Praetors by the Senate, and of their notification.¹⁴ The emperor contrasts the low grade of the office of *Temonarius* with that of Praetor by referring to the office of the latter as a *candidatus* and *honores certos*. Gothofredus, in his great commentary, failed to understand the significance of these features of the constitution and tried to make the

¹⁰ Cf. lines 10-12.

¹¹ *C. Th.*, 6, 4, 13, 21, 22.

¹² *C. Th.*, 11, 14, 11, 18.

¹³ In the Inscription, which is found on the last line of the preceding page of the manuscript.

¹⁴ The whole constitution thus forms a fairly unified whole, in that it serves as a list of general instructions to the Prefect of the City as to the method of notification (and appointment?) of the *Temonarii* and the Praetors.

whole constitution refer only to the appointment and notification of Praetors residing in the provinces. For this reason he emended *Temonarii* of line 1 and *Temona(rii)* of line 7 to either *Telonarii*, *Telotharrii*, *remotarii*, meaning Distant Dwellers, or *remorarii*, Shirkers, and he explained that this first part of the constitution dealt with the appointment of Praetors who dwelt at a considerable distance from Rome and who would seek every possible delay in the performance of this disagreeable burden. In his reconstruction of the text, Gothofredus resorts to various emendations, none of which has found general acceptance. He also makes lines 1, 2, 4, and 6 too short, with 37, 39, 37, and 39 letters respectively. Haenel also violates the requirements of the manuscript by making lines 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 too short, with 37, 39, 38, 38, and 36 letters respectively. Disregarding the manuscript tradition, Mommsen has 49 letters in lines 3 and 4 respectively, and only 37 each in lines 2 and 5. Since they are not able to offer intrinsically satisfactory restorations, all three of these editors resort freely to textual emendation, thereby creating many unnecessary difficulties. Krueger¹⁵ does not attempt any emendations but at the end of line 4 he is content with *fide*, with no indication of any loss, thus making a line of only 38 letters. At the beginning of line 5 he reads *uti quam* as two separate words, and he says of the whole passage "contextus mutilus vel corruptus."

Gothofredus is much disturbed by the fact that this constitution is placed under the title *De Quaestoribus et Praetoribus*. He is thus convinced that the whole of it must refer to the appointment of Praetors and he emends accordingly. In his commentary¹⁶ on this passage he says: "de absentibus, scilicet in remotis seu longinquis provinciis praetoribus designatis, primum hujus Valentiniana legis caput est, qui perperam hac lege Temonarii vocantur, et quidem duobus locis vitio librarii.¹⁷ Quid enim faciant hic Temonarii, qui erant auri tironici exactores et de quibus agetur inf. tit. de Tironibus?" Gothofredus was a man of such great learning and he wrote so voluminously that he sometimes forgot in one place what he wrote in another. For in his *Prolegomena ad Codicem Theodosianum*¹⁸ he calls attention to the *leges fugitivae* of the Code and he cites a number of examples. *Leges*

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 196-7.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*

¹⁷ I. e., lines 1 and 7.

¹⁸ Pp. cxxv-cxxvii.

fugitiae was a term used to denote constitutions or portions of constitutions of the Code that had been placed by the compilers under an inappropriate title. The first part of this constitution, the part dealing with *Temonarii* (lines 1-13) could have been easily classified as a *lex fugitiva* by Gothofredus, had he followed his customary practice in such cases. With his usual percentage of error Haenel presents an extensive list of such *leges fugitiae*.¹⁹ So no difficulty need be occasioned by the fact that this constitution is entered under the title *De Praetoribus et Quaestoribus* and by the further fact that the first part of it deals with *Temonarii*, their appointment, notification, and compulsion to the performance of their State Liturgy, while the latter part deals with the similar features regarding the office of praetor. In this constitution the emperor issues instructions to Bappo in his capacity as Prefect of the City and as the responsible official for the formal notification of the *Temonarii* and the Praetors. It is perhaps unnecessary to add that the Praetors at this time were burdened with the expensive and sometimes ruinous liturgy of having to provide at their own expense games and other amusements for the populace. Most of those selected as Praetors as well as those selected to be *Temonarii* used every possible device to evade this burdensome Liturgy. Since the Governors of the provinces and their Office Staffs could often be bribed to assist these appointees in their evasion of this compulsory state service, provisions had to be made whereby this law might be enforced. For an example of the corruption of these officials, see especially *C. Th.*, 1, 16, 7, where the emperor Constantine threatens and blusters, probably ineffectively, against corrupt officials, threatening them with dire punishment, first by "cutting off their rapacious hands" and then by "cutting off the heads and necks of the scoundrels." There are many similar indications throughout the Code of the venality and rascality of the Governors of the provinces and of their Office Staffs. This well established fact explains the statement of the emperor in this constitution, according to our proposed restoration of this passage, when he says:

"et si ita res expetit (et of-)
ficiis provinciarum ad pervestigandum fide(s ne-)
utiquam conmodatur," etc.

CLYDE PHARR.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

¹⁹ P. xxxvi, n. 213.

THE GOLDEN BOUGH OF PLATO.

Since the days of Servius and probably before that, scholars have been trying to discover what Vergil meant by the Golden Bough, sacred to Juno Inferna or Proserpina, which gave Aeneas the right to cross over the Styx. The assumption that it refers to some piece of folk lore not preserved to us is based largely on Servius' comment that *publica opinio* identified the Bough with the branch which was plucked by the King of the Grove in the sanctuary of Diana at Aricia.¹ Sir James Frazer's monumental work, *The Golden Bough*, accepting Servius' identification, has given subsequent thought on the subject a marked bias in this direction, at the expense of Servius' further item of information, that those who approach the *sacra* of Proserpina must carry boughs. Even scholars who see some further meaning in the Golden Bough accept the probability that its significance originates in some sort of nature worship.²

The Sixth Book of the *Aeneid* is, however, a very sophisticated piece of work. It springs from Vergil's omnivorous reading in all the literature of his time. The philosophers have had as much influence on it as the poets, if not more. The Hades which Aeneas traversed was no primitive place of death and torment, but a vision constructed by a mind permeated with the thoughts and techniques of Lucretius, Plato, and the Stoics.³ It is, therefore, a little surprising that so eminently civilized a person as Vergil should introduce this literary and intellectual passage, and the teaching which it conveys, by a rather pointless allusion to a bloody survival of primitive ritual. Even if he had done so and had attached to the Golden Bough a further allegorical meaning, we still would have no explanation of one of the oddest facts about it. After all the importance which is placed upon it at the beginning of the book, once Aeneas has used it to cross the river,

¹ Servius, *Aen.*, VI, 136.

² T. R. Glover, *Studies in Vergil* (London, 1904), p. 239. R. Conway, *The Vergilian Age* (Cambridge, 1928), pp. 41-53. Indeed Prescott says: "Such an obvious bit of folk lore is best left unsolved" (*Development of Vergil's Art* [1927], p. 370).

³ The importance of Plato in the Sixth Book has recently been stressed by Highbarger in his book *The Gate of Dreams* (Baltimore, 1940). Cf. T. Frank, *Vergil: A Biography* (New York, 1922), pp. 188-91.

it is disposed of summarily in a couple of lines and apparently no particular importance is attached to its final fate (VI, 635-6). Obviously its only function in the story is to serve as a passport across the river.

The literary nature of the Sixth Book suggests that perhaps, in searching for the meaning of the Golden Bough in the field of folk lore and comparative religion, we have been looking in the wrong place.⁴ It seems possible that we may have here a literary allusion. Since a passage to which such an allusion might refer has not been, and apparently cannot be, found among the great authors whom we know Vergil had read, we must look for it elsewhere. We know how marked an influence the Alexandrian and Neoteric poets had on his early work and there is no reason to suppose that poems from this field with which he had been familiar dropped from his mind when he came to the more serious task of composing the *Aeneid*. In the contemporary Greek poetry which he and his circle must have known we find the anthology composed by Meleager of Gadara. Its author gave it the fanciful title of the *Garland*, and wrote an introductory poem listing the authors included and describing the selections from each as the different flowers woven into his *Garland*. Some of these characterizations are quite surprising, and one may imagine that Vergil and his friends may have argued over the fairness or aptness of some of them. Introducing the epigrams of Plato (which scarcely seem to deserve such an encomium) he says (lines 47-8) :

ναὶ μὴν καὶ χρύσειον ἀεὶ θείοιο Πλάτωνος
κλῶνα, τὸν ἐξ ἀρετῆς πάντοθι λαμπόμενον.

The description is striking and must call to mind Vergil's line (*Aen.*, VI, 204) describing the finding of the Golden Bough :

discolor unde auri per ramos aura refusit.

The divine Plato whose ever golden branch gleams with *ἀρετή* can hardly be other than the philosopher, while *aureus ramus* is a legitimate translation of *χρύσειος κλών*.⁵

⁴ Cf. Glover, *loc. cit.*: "Vergil is moving in a different order of ideas altogether from those primitive fancies and usages connected with woods and cornfields."

⁵ Einarson has identified the plant to which Meleager compares Plato

If then Vergil put into Aeneas' hand the Golden Bough of Plato, what does it mean? Apparently Plato is to play some part in what is to come. It is no great riddle what the part may be. The resemblance between Aeneas' descent to Hades and the Myth of Er is plain, even if a good many other elements have entered into the latter work. If we look at the Myth of Er we find that at the end Socrates turns to Glaucon and says: *καὶ οὐτως ὃ Γλαύκων, μῆθος ἐσώθη καὶ οὐκ ἀπόλετο, καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀν σώσειεν, ἀν τειθώμεθα αὐτῷ καὶ τὸν τῆς Λήθης ποταμὸν εὖ διαβησόμεθα καὶ τὴν μνχὴν οὐ μιανθησόμεθα* (*Rep.*, X, 621 B). It was by means of the Golden Bough that Aeneas made Charon carry him across the Styx, so that he could see the after-life, just as Socrates showed the fate of the soul to Glaucon by means of a myth. The equation between Bough and myth seems plain. I have shown elsewhere reasons why I believe that Vergil conceived of Aeneas' journey to Hades as a dream.⁶ I would suggest now that the association with Plato embodied in the Golden Bough is an indication that Vergil is turning to Plato for help, and is using his device of the myth to convey, by the story of Aeneas' dream, the message which is the heart of his whole poem. In safeguarding Aeneas across the Styx, or in carrying Vergil from our world to the world of myth, the Golden Bough had discharged its function in the story and could be left behind as a dedication to Proserpina.

I do not mean to imply by what I have said that Vergil intended his readers, immediately on reading of the Golden Bough, to understand that he was about to pass into a Platonic myth. We have discovered two passages in authors known to Vergil which can give the Golden Bough a real significance for us. I would now like to suggest how these passages, joined with the item about the rites of Proserpina preserved by Servius, may have become associated in Vergil's mind with a problem of dramatic construction and may have led him to conceive the idea of the Golden Bough as it occurs in the *Aeneid*.

The purpose of Aeneas' descent into Hades is that past, present, and future may be linked together in the shapes of Anchises,

with the *ἄει χρύσειον*, or *Sempervivum arboreum*, in English the tree-houseleek. He associates the plant with the Platonic doctrine of immortality (*C. P.*, XXXIX [1943], pp. 260-1).

⁶ "Lucretius and the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*," *A. J. P.*, LXV (1944), pp. 135-48.

Aeneas, and their descendants, and that the responsibility of the present to the future may be emphasized by Anchises' prophecy of the future glory of Rome, which can only grow from Aeneas' present toil. In order that the future may be represented, Vergil has had to adopt the Platonic idea of reincarnation, and show the souls waiting to be born. I say adopt rather than accept because we cannot take any of the eschatological details in the Sixth Book as evidence for Vergil's personal belief. He is using mythology and philosophy as it suits his convenience, to convey an ethical concept. If Vergil is to bring home this concept of responsibility to the future with its full force, it is necessary for Aeneas to meet the past and future while he is himself consciously alive and aware of the problems of real life. He cannot see the after world as Er did, believing himself dead. As a result, Vergil was faced with the problem of inventing some method of carrying his hero safely across the Styx.⁷ None of the methods used by others who had accomplished the descent to Avernus would be suitable here. Something new must be devised. A poet does not attack a problem of invention logically. He is more apt to wait for what is called inspiration. He waits, while the ideas in his conscious and subconscious mind, with all their innumerable associations, shift and turn, group and regroup in constantly changing pictures and sequences. Finally something takes shape in his conscious mind and suddenly he recognizes what he has needed. It is a very difficult thing to analyze one's own train of thought, and dangerous to attempt it for another's. We cannot say what went on in Vergil's mind while he was brooding over Aeneas' passage to Hades, but we have tracked down some of the associations which he must have had with the Golden Bough and we cannot be far wrong if we believe that they formed the raw material from which he created it. The figure of Plato with his immortal golden bough, gleaming with virtue, and his striking phrase about the myth that will carry us over the river Lethe, the dark home of Proserpina and the picture of her

⁷ The equally important problem of how Aeneas is to return to the upper world is solved by treating the whole episode as a dream, and letting him return through the Ivory Gate to his awakening. Within the dream, however, there must be a realistic solution to the practical difficulty of dealing with Charon, who could not be quieted with honey cake.

devotees approaching her rites carrying boughs—somewhere in the poet's mind all this blended to form the image of Aeneas approaching the kingdom of the dead, carrying the Golden Bough which will force Charon to ferry him over the river Styx.

The Golden Bough was, then, a creation of Vergil's imagination, developed from a group of associations that were present in his mind while he was working on the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*. He did not intend it to be a symbol or to receive an allegorical interpretation. On the other hand it must still be able to evoke the associations from which it grew, and perhaps even others. Therefore in Vergil's own mind it would have been connected with Platonic doctrine, while, like all great poetry, it can mean to readers of the *Aeneid* what they can discover in it.

AGNES KIRSOPP MICHELS.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

DID MENANDER NOD? *EPITREPONTES* 53 (94 K.³).

I wish to add an argument, decisive in my opinion, to those in favour of L. de Stefani's arrangement which gives the question $\delta\omega\epsilon\sigma\omega\nu$, $\Sigma\nu\rho\sigma\kappa\epsilon$; to Davus and rejects any interference by the judge.¹ It is this: the judge cannot yet possibly know that Syriscus' $\delta\epsilon\sigma\theta\omega\alpha\iota$ (47 = 88 K.³) is a crucial point in the case. He therefore has no reason to interrupt the pleader. But Davus has the greatest interest in stressing that point, and making sure of Syriscus' admission, as soon as possible. The same applies to 57 (98 K.³) where de Stefani has made the corresponding alteration. The idea that the judge could hardly remain silent during so long a narrative seems to imply a misconception of Greek rhetoric and Greek administration of justice.

Two similar mispunctuations occur in two consecutive lines of the play, 685 f. (761 f. K.³); the first has been removed by Ida Kapp, the second by Legrand.

P. MAAS.

OXFORD.

¹ See *A. J. P.*, LXV (1944), pp. 175-8.

REVIEWS.

История Философии (History of Philosophy). Vol. I: Philosophy of Ancient and Feudalistic Society. Edited by G. F. ALEKSANDROV, B. E. BICHOVSKY, M. B. MITIN, P. F. YUDIN. Moscow, published by the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR., 1940. Pp. 491.

This is the first of seven projected volumes covering the history of philosophy from its beginning to the present. The second volume, covering the "period of the first accumulation of capital and the bourgeois revolutions (XV-XVIII centuries)," appeared in 1941. I have been unable to discover whether any of the succeeding volumes has yet appeared.

The interpretation of ancient philosophy contained in the first 396 pages of this volume constitutes a systematic presentation and evaluation of the achievements of Greek and Roman thinkers. The perspective from which the ancient philosophers are viewed is, of course, based on the prevailing intellectual attitudes of contemporary Russian thought; and the resultant picture is highly interesting and instructive, not only for its differences from the attitudes found in more traditional histories of philosophy, but also for its similarities to them.

The most significant and most impressive fact that emerges from the reading of this book is that ancient philosophy and ancient culture have a universality which transcends differences of political and social doctrine. The opinion sometimes encountered in this country that the study of the Classics is best suited to "aristocrats" or "conservatives" is refuted once and for all by the fact that even this "radical" Russian work expresses great respect and admiration for ancient thinkers and finds in them the foundation for all subsequent philosophy, including Marxism.

Another interesting feature of this book is that it is clearly written in the tradition of Western scholarship. In spite of Russia's obvious interest in the East, there is no evidence here of any attempt to trace Greek philosophy back to Oriental sources, or to give more than usual prominence to the Byzantine philosophers. The authors' familiarity with the works of minor figures in Greek philosophy indicates that modern scholarly studies such as Diels' *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* must have been consulted. Of course, comments of Marx and Lenin on ancient philosophers are given special prominence. The work is well documented, and in its critical standards it is in no way inferior to any comparable American or British history of ancient philosophy.

Its distinctive character is to be found in its selection of material and its major emphases. A conspicuous feature is the assertion that philosophical thought is the result of "social-historical causes." Every philosopher is related to the social and economic conditions under which he lived. At frequent intervals throughout the book appear brief historical descriptions characterizing the chief political,

economic, social, and even religious and cultural conditions of the various periods of ancient philosophy: the early Greek period (pp. 7-24), the fifth century (pp. 88-9, 117-21, 133-5), the Hellenistic period (248-9), the Roman period (pp. 310-20), and the Christian period (pp. 377-80). Besides these passages there are constant references to history in connection with each philosopher's social and political theories, activities, or influence.

The basic fact about ancient society, we are told, is that it rested on slavery. The distinction between slave and free was the most fundamental class division, and the other social strata which existed only among free men, such as distinctions between aristocrats and democrats, were of a secondary nature. Philosophers were influenced by these class divisions. Pythagoras, for instance, was a champion of aristocracy against slave-owning democracy (p. 41). The Sophist Protagoras was a spokesman of slave-owning democracy (pp. 130-1). Zeno the Stoic directed his philosophy to all classes, even the slaves (p. 284). It is clear that this effort to relate philosophy to other aspects of society presupposes a comprehensive view of society. It is not possible in a history of philosophy to present an adequate picture of ancient society as a whole; hence the historical generalizations sometimes appear to need further substantiation. There are also involved certain Marxist principles of the interpretation of history which would arouse hostility in some quarters. But the principle that the philosophy of a people can be fully understood only in relation to the society and culture of that people as a whole seems to me to be more carefully adhered to in this book than in most traditional histories of philosophy.

The interest in the relation of philosophy to history leads to a comparatively detailed treatment of Roman philosophy. The discussion of the various modifications that Stoicism received in Roman society covers twenty pages. Another fifteen pages are devoted to Roman Epicureanism. As the periods of philosophy are determined by historical units, the Roman period emerges as distinct from the Greek. What is more, the new period established by the expansion of Rome produced a single Greco-Roman culture, and such late Greek authors as Lucian and Epictetus are discussed under Roman, not under Greek philosophy. In other words, philosophical literature is classified not by the language in which it was written, but in terms of the society which produced it.

The more abstract problems of philosophy, including logic and metaphysics, also reveal special emphases. Although all philosophers, major and minor, from Thales to Proclus, from Aristotle to Teles, are mentioned, yet those philosophers are particularly favored who made some contribution either to dialectic or to materialism (as these constitute the Marxian dialectical materialism). Specifically, Aristotle receives by far the fullest treatment (70 pages), which is on the whole very favorable. Socrates and Plato, on the other hand, are severely criticized. The picture of Socrates is taken mainly from Xenophon, and it occupies only eight pages. Plato receives twenty-six pages. His theory of Ideas is not congenial to the authors' point of view, although they are very much interested in his dialectic. Democritus, on the other hand, receives a very full discussion (23 pages). In his case the authors do not merely present the available

information about him, but they also undertake to defend at some length their view on the reliability of the ancient sources, particularly in connection with his views on chance and on sense perception. Such detailed arguments are not ordinarily found in general histories of philosophy.

The Hellenistic period of philosophy is rather favorably treated, both because of the materialistic and atheistic tendencies of that period, and because of the interest of Hellenistic philosophers in social problems. It is interesting to note that the skeptic Carneades receives more attention than is usually given him. In general, the decline of ancient philosophy is postponed somewhat in the interpretation presented in this volume. It is not until the revival of religious mysticism at the beginning of the Christian era that the disintegration of ancient society brought with it the decline of ancient philosophy (p. 367). Both the Neo-Platonists and the early Christian theologians, though important historical phenomena, were obstacles rather than aids to the progress of philosophy.

This *History of Philosophy* was intended for wide circulation in Russia. According to the official statements in the books, 50,000 copies of the first volume were authorized, 75,000 copies of the second volume. The work is particularly significant, therefore, as a step in the expansion of contemporary Russian thought to the point where it will be an adequate vehicle for the interpretation of all phases of human activity. As the Russian ideology promises to become one of the major intellectual movements of our time, it is especially important that we keep informed of the progress of its development. It is with this aim in mind, rather than with any intention either to praise or censure, that I wish to call to the attention of American Classicists this new treatment of ancient philosophy.

PHILLIP DE LACY.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

ROBERT SAMUEL ROGERS. *Studies in the Reign of Tiberius. Some Imperial Virtues of Tiberius; Drusus Julius Caesar.* Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Pp. viii + 181. \$2.25.

Professor Rogers has added another significant study to our understanding of the reign of Tiberius. This book, coming after his *Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation Under Tiberius* (American Philological Monographs, VI [Middletown, 1935]) and several important articles, should establish him as a worthy successor to the late Frank Burr Marsh in this field.

As is revealed in the Preface, the first half of the book, entitled "Some Imperial Virtues of Tiberius," presents three lectures which were delivered at The Johns Hopkins University in 1940. The second half is devoted to a historical and biographical study of Drusus Julius Caesar, the son of Tiberius. The virtues of Tiberius which the author discusses are *Liberalitas, Providentia, Clementia, and Moderatio.* The section on Drusus has successive chapters on his youth and family, his public career, his relations with Sejanus, his appearance and character. A key to the abbreviations, a Select

Bibliography, an Index of Passages Cited, and a detailed general Index complete the book.

One who holds the usual view of Tiberius may be surprised to learn that that emperor had any virtues. So recent a work as *Webster's Biographical Dictionary*, which came off the press as this review was being prepared, speaks of Tiberius as "vicious, cruel, and tyrannical" and asserts that he probably caused the death of his nephew Germanicus Caesar and of his son Drusus and that he abolished freedom in Rome. Apparently the writings of Baring-Gould, Marsh, Rogers, Charlesworth, and other historians have not yet succeeded in correcting, for the general reader, at least, the long prevailing reputation of Tiberius as a sinister tyrant.

In the first chapter, which deals with *Liberalitas* and *Providentia*, Rogers marshals an impressive list of examples, gleaned from historians, monumental inscriptions, and coins, of liberality and generosity in a ruler who has hardly been regarded as a generous man even by those who no longer deem him a tyrant. These acts of generosity were directed towards both individuals and cities, towards the Roman populace and the soldiers, and were manifested through grants of money, building of public works, and relief measures in times of calamity. Occasionally Rogers suggests a parallel with present-day problems, as when he refers to the "Reconstruction Finance Corporation" in A. D. 33 (p. 12). The emperor's *providentia* was shown through his efforts in protecting his people from danger, as by quelling disorders, settling foreign problems with diplomacy instead of arms, suppressing conspiracies, and concerning himself with the problem of insuring the succession. In this connection Rogers presents an outline of Tiberius' unhappy efforts to provide for and train a successor (pp. 30-2).

In the second chapter the author demonstrates successfully that the imperial virtue of *clementia*, manifested, for example, in the granting of a pardon after conviction or the quashing of an indictment or the mitigating of a severe penalty, characterized the entire reign of Tiberius, although some recent authorities, while granting that Tiberius showed *clementia* in the earlier part of his reign (i. e. until about A. D. 23), deny it to him after that time. In this chapter Rogers argues (especially pp. 57-9) that the indictment of Agrippina and her son Nero must have come not after the death of Livia in 29, but in 28, some time prior to her death. Still, in the face of the precise account in Tacitus, *Annals*, V, 3-5 ("here the historian errs," says Rogers), one hesitates to accept even the "explicit and unexceptionable" statement of Suetonius to the contrary. Rogers stresses this point because he believes that the otherwise unexplained erection of an altar to *Clementia* in A. D. 28 was occasioned by Tiberius' clemency in having Agrippina and Nero banished instead of executed after their conviction of conspiracy.

Moderatio, the subject of the third chapter, a virtue often confused with *clementia*, is differentiated from it as involving such acts as the restraints placed by the emperor on the numerous honors which were proposed for himself and the other members of the imperial family; his repressing of excessive demonstrations in connection with funerals of members of his family; his refusal to permit the *Lex Maiestatis* to be applied to instances of libel and slander of himself (in this

connection Rogers appositely notes [p. 73] Tiberius' pronouncement, "In a free state speech and thought ought to be free,"—hardly the utterance of a freedom-abolishing "tyrant"); his prevention of efforts to expand the power of the princeps ("Rights were impaired whenever power [of the emperor] increased, nor should imperial authority be employed when procedure was possible under the laws"); his effort to make the senate and the magistrates responsible partners in the rule. He showed *moderatio* also in dealing with demands that the taxes of the provinces be increased ("It is the part of a good shepherd to shear his flock, not to skin it"). He was modest, furthermore, in his simple mode of living and in his hatred of flattery.

The second part of the volume is devoted to a biography of Drusus Julius Caesar, apparently the fullest biography yet published of that unamiable prince. Every scrap of information about Drusus has been assembled and given its proper setting. For the date of his birth Rogers rightly favors 13 B. C. (p. 92), though admitting that he may have been born one or two years earlier. Attention is called (pp. 95 f.) to the almost forgotten fact that a son was born to Drusus and Livilla between the birth of Julia and that of the twin boys. This child, who died when but a few years old, had been overlooked by nearly all the historians.

In the chapter on Drusus' public career the biographer leaves us with the impression that he was a conscientious and energetic administrator. He performed the duties of his magistracies competently; he suppressed the Pannonian revolt with courage and firmness, here showing himself much more efficient than Germanicus in a similar situation; his administration of his province in Illyricum is shown to have been notably successful, despite the sneers of Dessau (pp. 122 f.).

The third chapter of the biography of Drusus traces in detail the relationship between Drusus and Sejanus. The open enmity between them, coming to a head in a fist fight, seems to have begun in A. D. 20, in which year Rogers thinks (pp. 142 f.) Sejanus conceived his plot against Drusus' life, a murder which was to be the first step in his ambitious plan to attain the imperial position.

The final chapter begins with a description of the appearance of Drusus, based on the few existing portraits, particularly the Avignon head. Here one might find fault with Rogers' attempt to interpret character through physiognomy (p. 147), but fortunately this type of argument is not stressed and the author's final judgment is based on more reliable criteria. The work is concluded with a masterly evaluation of Drusus. He is characterized as hard-working, competent and loyal. On the other hand, while noble in bearing, he lacked nobility of character. He was arrogant, hot-tempered, vindictive, fond of luxury and strong drink, cruel, bloodthirsty, dissolute, and licentious. Still, he was very popular, despite Tacitus' implications to the contrary. Because of his experience, capability, and devotion to duty he would probably have been an able successor to Tiberius, possibly proving himself "prototype of Domitian—absolutist, cruel, domineering and able."

In the entire book Rogers shows a thorough familiarity with his sources, which he handles accurately and effectively. Not only does he know his Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio, and Velleius, in so far as they

deal with the reign of Tiberius, but he makes good use of epigraphic and numismatic evidence. It is gratifying that Rogers, with few exceptions, offers his own translations of the passages he cites. Despite an occasional infelicity, his renderings are smooth and accurate. Here and there a *loc. cit.* is too far from its previous reference, but not often enough to be annoying.

While sundry recent historians have discussed the virtues of Tiberius, we now have for the first time a complete, thoroughly documented account of them. So convincing is Rogers' presentation of the data that we can well agree with his judgment that "Trajan was not the first *Optimus Princeps*."

HARRY J. LEON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

FRANK BURR MARSH. *Modern Problems in the Ancient World.*

Austin, Texas, Univ. of Texas Press, 1943. Pp. 123. \$1.00.

The title given this collection of five short papers indicates a broader range than the contents cover. Professor Marsh limited himself to analyzing the relationship between agricultural depression, unemployment, and government in Athens under Solon and Pericles and in the Roman Republic; and although the Introduction suggests that such study may enable us to understand contemporary problems better, no further reference is made to them. But within its limitations the book presents an unusually penetrating analysis of certain economic factors, and does it with conspicuous clarity and force.

The conclusions which challenge previous interpretations are as follows: Solon's reforms were essentially economic, for the purpose of avoiding revolution; "far from holding any democratic views," he introduced minor political changes merely to safeguard his "new deal" and guarantee its future enforcement. But he did little to help the farmers to keep out of debt; it remained for Pisistratus, "a statesman of real ability," to create prosperity by his program of public works, increased industrial production, and land-grants and loans at low interest rates. A second economic crisis developed in early 5th century Athens, when the importation of slaves resulted in widespread unemployment. This was met by Themistocles' naval construction program, which paved the way for Athenian hegemony in the Eastern Mediterranean. Once the Delian Confederacy was established, Athens could not allow secession, because the safety of her trade routes was at stake, any serious reduction in the fleet would throw many Athenians out of work, and the tribute money was required in order to maintain a public works program. Over a fifth of the Athenian citizens depended on the Empire for a livelihood. These considerations determined Athens' political policy. She could not safely be more liberal toward her so-called Allies who were controlled by anti-democratic governments; and any extension of Athenian citizenship to subjects in the Empire would dangerously imperil democracy at home. So Athens' imperial policy was economically and politically sound. It worked also, on the whole, to the advantage of the "Allies," and "had so broad a base of popular support that

it could not be seriously shaken until the power of Athens seemed hopelessly broken by the Sicilian disaster."

Turning to Rome, Marsh dismisses as inadequate the theories that the Republic fell because a city-state could not govern an Empire, and because there was widespread corruption and provincial mismanagement. The chief cause was the failure of the Senate to solve an economic problem involving the army: how to meet the soldiers' demands for farms. In consequence, the Republic had to rely on volunteer armies whose allegiance was paid to generals who could provide them with land rather than to the government. The Senate failed to solve this problem because the four or five hundred families who controlled Rome made political power their primary aim, and opposed every attempt at economic reform. The Republic might have been saved had the Senate shown wisdom enough to provide farms for the soldiers. Instead, its selfish stupidity made a military dictatorship inevitable.

Marsh has presented the evidence for his interpretation of Athenian and Roman development with great skill, and by bringing into high relief certain economic factors which have hitherto been minimized he has performed a useful service. As he himself admits, however, the evidence in many instances is inadequate to justify more than conjectural conclusions; and it seems that the conclusions fail sometimes to reckon sufficiently with other than economic (chiefly agricultural) factors. For instance, not enough credit is given Solon's effort to develop industry and trade (the best remedy for agricultural depression), or his statesmanship in making government an impartial arbiter; the power he gave the Thetes to nominate their magistrates and the establishment of the Heliae had more than economic significance. Aristotle was right in considering Solon the founder of Athenian democracy. Again, he fails to appreciate Pericles' political astuteness in creating a coalition of labor and business interests, in opposition to the landed aristocracy; or the possibility that Athens might have avoided the Sicilian debacle had this coalition been maintained; or the elements of political ineptitude in Athens' administration of the Empire. In the chapters on Rome the interrelation among economic, military, and political forces is more broadly visualized; but there, also, the effect of one economic factor seems to be unduly stressed.

WALTER R. AGARD.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

HUMPHRY TREVELYAN. *Goethe and the Greeks*. Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Co., 1941. Pp. xvi + 321. \$3.75.

Trevelyan, who in 1934 published a study on "The popular background to Goethe's Hellenism," in his new book gives what so far has been lacking in the vast literature on Goethe and the Greeks: "a coherent chronological account of the stages by which Goethe gained knowledge and understanding of Greece" (p. xi). The individual data on which this survey is based are, of course, well

known. Many an attempt had previously been made to draw a general picture of Goethe's relation to things Greek (cf. Bibliography, pp. xiii-xv). Yet nobody has ever brought out the biographical implications of this problem in so painstaking and comprehensive a manner as has Trevelyan.¹ The bearing of Goethe's Hellenism on the unfolding of his personality is disclosed. And just as Goethe himself saw his life as a unique historical process which at the same time had symbolic meaning, so he is understood by Trevelyan as the protagonist of "Europeanism"; his attitude toward the Greeks is evaluated in its importance for the maintenance of the "European ideal" (cf. especially Conclusion, pp. 285 ff.). The book under review, then, is much more than a catalogue of facts arranged according to a certain point of view and made easily available.

I cannot try here to give an appreciation of all the details of Trevelyan's findings concerning Goethe's knowledge of the Greeks. Generally speaking, now for the first time it is possible to see clearly how proficient Goethe was in the classical languages, what he read of ancient literature, what he saw of ancient art in the various phases of his development. Besides, a few points may be emphasized. Goethe never became as good a Hellenist as he was a Latinist. When reading Greek authors, with the exception of Homer, "he was never happy unless he had a translation at hand" (p. 54). Moreover, much as he had intended in his early youth to study Greek literature in its entirety (pp. 27; 33), he actually never did so. His reading remained desultory, determined by the interests of the day (pp. 64; 96), though at some moments it was quite intensive as well as extensive (pp. 223; 251). Art objects, however, he surveyed systematically, at least ever after he went to Rome (pp. 144 ff.). So keen was his interest in them that in later years he played with the idea of visiting London in order to see the Parthenon sculptures of which he had already procured for himself life-size drawings since he was dissatisfied with the published small-scale reproductions (pp. 266 f.).

That Goethe throughout his life was concerned with enlarging his familiarity with Greek literature and art cannot be doubted. Most interpreters also believe that from the very beginning he was under the spell of Antiquity, that even for the young Goethe the classics represented the ideal of beauty. To be sure they admit that in some periods Goethe was negligent of Greece, but these they consider times of apostasy. Moreover, it is usual to contend that Winckelmann was the guiding spirit of Goethe's endeavor to understand Greece, the master to whom the pupil remained faithful almost all his life.²

¹ It should be stressed that, in the presentation of the material, completeness is intended with some discrimination. As regards the formative period of Goethe's acquaintance with the classics, the first three chapters (pp. 1-120) record "every piece of evidence which suggests an interest in Greece"; concerning the later decades of Goethe's life, however, in which his familiarity with antiquity was "essentially complete," the last three chapters (pp. 121-284) note only those facts and utterances "which throw light on his conception of the nature and value of the Greek heritage" (p. xi).

² Cf. e. g. W. Rehm, *Griechentum und Goethezeit* (*Das Erbe der Alten*, Zweite Reihe, XXVI, 1936), p. 121; cf. 162: "Man kann sich bei Goethe die Verbindung mit dem Bestreben Winckelmanns garnicht

With both these assumptions Trevelyan takes issue and, in my opinion, successfully. He shows that for the Goethe of "Sturm und Drang," just as for the student at Leipzig, Greek mythology and literature provided nothing more than a number of conventional symbols (pp. 83; 40 f.). Greek art to him was of great interest, but in his young years he let pass an opportunity to see Greek statues because Dutch paintings attracted him more strongly (pp. 36 f.). Only gradually did the Greeks become an exemplar; only in the first years in Weimar did they begin to mean everything to him (p. 90). As for Winckelmann, Goethe was acquainted with his theories from the time of his stay in Leipzig. But he did not become his disciple, he did not accept any of his central doctrines (p. 43); he disagreed with Winckelmann's interpretation of the Laocoön group (pp. 46 ff.).³

What then was the young Goethe's understanding of Greece, if it was not tinged by Winckelmann's ideal of "noble simplicity and quiet greatness"? In the years between his studies in Leipzig and his coming to Weimar he praised the sincerity of the ancients, their closeness to life which they expressed in their productions without restraint (pp. 48; 70), though not in formlessness (p. 77). In the first years at Weimar, Trevelyan says, Goethe felt that he must reproduce in the poetical medium the "noble simplicity and quiet greatness" of Greek statuary (p. 95). But, though it is true that at that time Goethe granted perfect beauty to the Greeks, he held them to be lacking in "the Good and the True" (p. 103). The morality of *Iphigenia* is Christian, as Schiller rightly pointed out to Goethe, and as the poet himself was well aware (pp. 99 ff.). The Greeks then had only an aesthetic message, not a moral one as they had for Winckelmann. When soon afterwards Greek art became recognized as a moral and aesthetic ideal, perhaps after Goethe had better understood the essence of Greek sculpture (p. 119), it was pagan objectivity and pagan amorality that he experienced as highest values. Liberated from what he came to consider the prejudice of Christianity, realizing that Herder's "Humanität" was but "a fair dream-wish" (p. 168), Goethe, for a short time, in form and matter made the classics the object of an almost slavish imitation (pp. 179 ff.). This was in the spirit of Winckelmann's teaching. Nevertheless he differed from Winckelmann, for the Greeks were believed by Goethe to have acknowledged the element of power, of crude force, and even to have idealized it in their mythology.⁴ And the

eng genug denken." I refer to Rehm because his book is the most representative of the recent studies on the subject. An illuminating appreciation of Goethe's relation to Greece has been given by E. Feise, "The Greek Tradition in Germany," in *The Greek Tradition*, ed. G. Boas (1939), pp. 177 ff.

³ Trevelyan claims that Goethe did not read Winckelmann's *History of Art* until he came to Rome. His statements on this point are not quite consistent. Once (p. 36) he finds it probable that the young Goethe left the *History of Art* unread; at another place (p. 140) it seems quite clear to him that this was so; cf. also p. 118. I do not think that this question can be decided with certainty.

⁴ Trevelyan assumes that Moritz' theories on mythology reflect Goethe's point of view (pp. 145 ff.). This is, I think, quite correct,

Roman Elegies with their Homeric naiveté expressed in the style of Propertius and Tibullus (p. 183) are hardly reconcilable with "noble simplicity and quiet greatness." Eventually Goethe abandoned the endeavor to be a Greek among the Germans; for imitation led to utter failure in the attempt at its poetical execution. Forthwith the Greek achievement became a cherished ideal, the loftiest of all. Modern man must marvel at the greatness of the ancients but must resign himself with regret to his own shortcomings, which in a better mood he may call his "barbarous advantages" (p. 258). Nothing is left to him but to try to reproduce in his own time their truthfulness, and like them to be intent to "moderate the storms of suffering and passion through beauty both sensual and spiritual" (p. 221). The pendulum had swung back a full sweep. The final judgment of Goethe expresses in a slightly different language the notion of his early years: that the Greeks were sincere though not formless. To be sure, Goethe was deeply concerned with Winckelmann's doctrines, but at no time, it seems, did his concept of Greece coincide with that of Winckelmann. Goethe himself has well characterized his relation to Winckelmann, its positive and its negative sides, in his words to Eckermann (February 16, 1827): "Man lernt nichts, wenn man ihn liest, aber man wird etwas."

The peculiarity of Goethe's attitude toward Greece and its art is obvious. It is stressed again and again by Trevelyan, although I have gone further perhaps in my emphasis than he does. Certainly the matter would have become clearer had Trevelyan not excluded from his study Goethe's connection with ancient science. One is indeed astonished not to find any but the most casual mention of this subject.⁵ And yet Goethe in reading Kant saw with pleasure that "Dichtkunst und vergleichende Naturkunde so nah miteinander verwandt seien, indem beide sich derselben Urteilskraft unterwerfen."⁶ Poetry and science, to Goethe, were not essentially different departments of human activity; to isolate his understanding of poetry from that of science is impossible. Moreover, in science too Goethe acknowledged the superiority of the Greeks; in the same years in which their art became exemplary for him, he discovered the greatness of Aristotle, the naturalist.⁷ Goethe thus assumed a leading rôle in the development that restored the authority of the ancients in science. A follower of Diderot and Buffon, a precursor of St.-Hilaire, he defended Greek descriptive science against mathematical science, as it was represented by men like Euler and Bernoulli who felt superior to the ancients.⁸ Aristotle, Goethe believed, had seen nature

though it is sometimes doubted. Trevelyan's interpretation of Moritz' teaching, moreover, seems to me more adequate than that given e.g. by Rehm, *op. cit.*, pp. 165 ff.

⁵ Cf. e.g. Hippocrates (p. 71); Pre-Socratic philosophy (p. 266).

⁶ The passage is quoted by Th. Ziehen, *Goethes Naturphilosophische Anschauungen*, in *Goethe als Seher und Erforscher der Natur*, ed. J. Walther (1930), p. 38.

⁷ Cf. P. Petersen, *Goethe und Aristoteles* (1914), p. 20; M. Heynacher, *Goethes Philosophie* (*Philosophische Bibliothek*, 1922²), p. XXX; in general cf. also K. Schlechta, *Goethe in seinem Verhältnis zu Aristoteles*, (*Frankf. Studien z. Religion u. Kultur d. Antike*, 1938).

⁸ Cf. E. Cassirer, *Goethe u. die geschichtliche Welt* (1932), pp. 93 ff.;

more correctly than any modern, though he had been too quick in drawing his conclusions (Eckermann, October 1, 1828). And what constituted the uniqueness of the Greeks? Already in Strassburg, Goethe delighted in Hippocrates' "Aussprüchen der reinen Erfahrung," in his sincerity, in his distrust of hypotheses.⁹ Aristotle too was a master of unprejudiced experience. But at the same time he was able to perceive the ideality of nature whose life-like dynamism he admitted. He beheld the idea behind the phenomena, or rather inherent in them, for he rightly refused to transcend reality. He was a "Realidealist" as was Goethe, the scientist.¹⁰ And is it not also "Realidealismus" that characterizes his evaluation of Greek art? Does he not mean to say that the eternal message of the Greeks is their summons to accept reality, yet to recognize it as it is by grasping also the higher element, the idea, the beauty, that is contained in every phenomenon, however terrifying and imperfect? The poet who is a creator like God must make clearly visible the beauty within the terrifying; he must make the imperfect perfect. Thus he will restore it to its true, its ideal reality.

Nobody was better prepared than Trevelyan to trace minutely and to evaluate in detail Goethe's relation to Greek science which I have attempted to sketch briefly. It is a pity that he did not do so. His book would have gained in scope and value. I am sorry that my review must end on a somewhat negative note. For Trevelyan's contribution, in my opinion, is outstanding among the studies that have been published in recent years on that hackneyed theme of Goethe and the Greeks.

LUDWIG EDELSTEIN.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

JAMES J. DONAHUE. *The Theory of Literary Kinds—Ancient Classifications of Literature*. Dubuque, Iowa, The Loras College Press, 1943. Pp. vi + 155.

The subtitle of this work indicates that the present volume, accepted as a Doctoral dissertation by the English Department of the University of Iowa, is the first of four installments on the larger theme of the "Theory of Literary Kinds." It seeks to enquire "into the ancient views of the distinctions obtaining between the spoken and the written word, between prose and poetry, and between the practical and fine arts of writing. It . . . sketches what the writers of antiquity took to be the branches of literature. It then devotes its most important chapter to general systems of classification. . . . Finally the study closes in a chapter that is less by way of conclusion than by way of summary" (p. 2), with a composite of ancient classifications in tabular form.

for Bernoulli, cf. E. Fueter, *Geschichte d. exakten Wissenschaften in der schweizerischen Aufklärung* (Veröffentl. d. Schweiz. Gesellsch. f. Gesch. d. Medizin u. d. Naturwissenschaften, XII [1941]), pp. 98 ff.

⁹ Cf. in general K. Deichgräber, *Goethe und Hippokrates* (Archiv f. Gesch. d. Medizin, XXIX [1937]), pp. 27 ff.

¹⁰ Cf. Petersen, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

After an introductory chapter in which the author disclaims professional competence in formal criticism and historical study of the classical literatures and presents an elementary chronological outline of ancient literature, he turns in Chapter II to a discussion of the relationship of the spoken to the written word. He reviews the preferences of the early Greeks for "speech-related" literature, e.g., recitation, singing, drama, oratory, and Socratic philosophy; the "tension" in the Alexandrian age between the "live utterance" of the declamation(?) and the bookish products of the grammaticus; and the conflict in the Roman period between oratory and bookish poetry.

This discussion is marred by two over-subtleties. Aristotle cannot on the basis of the Greek text of *Poetics* 1462 a be made to "insist that reading is a sufficient discovery of poetic experience" (p. 21). He is merely stating the obvious fact that the substance of a tragedy lies in the text which *can* be read. Again, when Quintilian (*Inst. Orat.*, X, III, 3) calls written discourse the root and foundation of eloquence (p. 23), he is not stressing any "tension" between speech and writing, but is merely recommending drill in writing speeches as a prerequisite to good extempore control.

Chapter III deals with the ancient criteria of distinction between prose and poetry, a distinction which became harder to define after the introduction of artistic prose by Gorgias, and its further elaboration by Isocrates. Plato did not go beyond the obvious criterion of meter. Aristotle, while keeping to this in the *Rhetoric*, added in the *Poetics* the further requirement that true poetry be distinguished by "imitation," a quality which may be shared also by prose in making up the "nameless language art" (*Poetics* 1447 b). This Aristotelian view remained practically unchanged throughout antiquity.

Chapter IV establishes Aristotle's threefold division of prose into logic, rhetoric, and history, but is largely concerned with explanations of the Aristotelian term "imitation," particularly in its application to poetry. Apparently without benefit of Finsler's *Platon und die Aristotelische Poetik*, the author traces with considerable skill the promotion of the concept of "imitation" from the subordinate rôle which it holds in the Platonic scale of realities to its Aristotelian prominence as the chief and natural creative function of the artist. He arrives at the following definition of poetry based on "imitation": "Thus poetry is the re-integration of intellectual analysis in the sensory medium of metrical language" (p. 62). In this connection the reviewer was reminded of the definition by Theodore Watts: "Absolute poetry is the concrete and artistic expression of the human mind in emotional and rhythmic language," and was pleased to note that in the latter part of this chapter evidence from Longinus and others was adduced as a "corrective" of the Aristotelian summary to supply the missing element of emotion.

Chapter V seeks to schematize the subdivisions, primarily of poetry, which are derived from Plato, Aristotle, the Tractatus Coislinianus, the Alexandrian Canons, Varro, Horace, Quintilian, and Suetonius. A great deal of patient work is here manifest, but since the criteria of subdivision vary so greatly from author to author—medium, subject, purpose, external form, music, etc.—no adequate summary is possible here. The chapter represents, however, the most valuable

portion of the work in that it assembles accurately in their main outlines all the chief schemes of antiquity.

Unfortunately the last chapter attempts a tabular synthesis of all these incompatible systems. The result, to quote the author himself, "is not very penetrating, not very consistent, not very realistic, not very right" (p. 129). It is also not very new, because, by necessarily cancelling out the individual points of view of conflicting theorists, the author is left with nothing but the obvious and stereotyped framework of fine prose and practical prose, mere verse and true poetry which may be lyric, dramatic, semi-dramatic, and non-dramatic.

The chief value of this work as a whole seems to be in the convenient assembling and interpretation for the non-classical reader of the scattered testimonia on literary classification, and in the freshness of approach by a vigorous mind to a very trite and dull subject. On the other hand lack of philological training and exclusive dependence on English translations, and on English-written secondary sources, unavoidably result in small inaccuracies, in the occasional presentation of well-known facts and combinations as novelties (e. g. a long discussion and an appendix to prove that Aristotle's "nameless art" means "fine literature"), and in naive acceptance of doubtful points (e. g. that *Iliad*, VI, 168-9 necessarily refers to writing [p. 27, n. 1]; or the absurd suggestion [p. 147, lines 8-11] that *ētorouia* could be retained in the text of Aristotle, *Poetics*, I, 6 [1447 a] in the sense of "word-poetry" as the explicit title of the "nameless art").

To the list of Errata may be added the following from the first thirty-five pages only: p. 12, line 18, "Theagenes" for "Theagines"; p. 23, n. 36, "Ibid X, vii, 1" for "Ibid X, vi, 1"; p. 28, n. 3, line 4, "twenty-two fragments" for "seventeen fragments"; p. 30, n. 13, "Republie, 607d" for "Republie, 607"; p. 32, n. 21, line 4, "Joannes Sicel., VI, p. 156, 19" for "Joannes Sicel., VI, p. 159, 19."

WARREN E. BLAKE.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

ANNA GRANVILLE HATCHER. *Reflexive Verbs: Latin, Old French, Modern French.* Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942. Pp. 213. (*The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages*, XLIII.)

The aim and scope of this monograph are stated in the Foreword, in which the author explains that she proposes "to study the development of the reflexive construction over the two millennia that are covered by Latinity and Romania, seen as a continuous historical unit." She then adds, as the title indicates, that she has restricted her study to three periods: Latin, Old French, and Modern French. As a matter of fact the investigations have been much more closely limited, since the Latin works studied are chiefly Vergil, Cicero, and Plautus. It is fortunate that she has devoted a careful examination to the comedies of Plautus, for she has found in them many good examples of the language of the people, but one regrets that the

study has not included a wider representation of the classical writers and particularly texts of other periods. The Vulgar Latin works are scarcely mentioned and no evidence is given that they have been carefully examined. I have noted four examples cited from the *Mulomedicina*, given inconspicuously in a footnote on page 73. Another reference is made to this text on page 188, but without additional citations. It is to be regretted that such works as the *Peregrinatio* and those of Gregory of Tours were not thoroughly combed. From the Classical Latin the author passes to a study of some of the earliest Old French texts including some early fragments, the *Roland* and a few other *chansons de geste*, the *Lais* of Marie de France and one of the poems of Chrestien de Troyes. Even though the author had decided not to continue her investigations into the thirteenth century, it is unfortunate that she did not include in her study the works of the early religious drama, such as the *Jeu d'Adam* and the *Jeu de S. Nicolas*. Since Miss Hatcher found in the comedies of Plautus a rich source of material for her study of the reflexives in Latin, one regrets that her choice of Old French texts did not include examples of the popular language, such as the *fabliaux*, the *farces*, and the *Roman de Renart*. The third study of the triptych (the word is hers) is based upon selected works of eleven well-known modern writers from Flaubert to Jules Romains, including Maupassant, Zola, and Anatole France. Here again the drama is conspicuously slighted, but what is more amazing is the gulf between the early Old French and the middle of the nineteenth century. A work based on three widely spaced periods and limited to comparatively few works from the three periods chosen can hardly offer material for a study of the *development* of the reflexive construction, seen as a continuous historical unit.

In her Introduction Miss Hatcher seeks to find the source of the reflexive construction in the "R-form verbs," by which she means the deponents, mediopassives, and passives. She frankly admits (p. 13) that it is sometimes hard to distinguish between the last two classes. After a careful study of such deponents as *sequor* and *vescor*, showing how they are to be distinguished from the verbs active in meaning as well as in form, she notes the gradual weakening of the deponents and the development of the simple active verbs. This is followed by the contrast between the medio-passives and the intransitives in the verbs expressing natural movement or movement caused by agency. This last class closely approaches the real passive. The medio-passive system was threatened by two dangers, the intransitive and the reflexive, the latter of which is the subject of this volume.

In order to make a thorough comparison of the different categories of reflexive verbs the author has seen the importance of constructing an outline and a classification of the different types of these verbs. She admits (p. 7) that she started with an examination of the different uses of the reflexive verbs in Modern French and that from this point of departure she constructed her scheme, which is sufficiently complete to include the verbs of the earlier periods. This piece of work she has done with skill and care, so that it seems adequate for her purpose in this work. If subsequent studies are to be made of the reflexives in the other Romance languages, such as Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, and Rumanian, it may be necessary

to modify and perhaps enlarge the divisions in order to include new divergencies, but for the present study the outline is satisfactory. For some of the classes the author has found comparatively few examples in Latin or in Old French, but usually enough to serve as prototypes for the modern constructions. She first divides the reflexives into two groups, according to whether the subject of the verb is animate or inanimate. The first group is arranged according to three patterns: I: Verbs which represent the subject as doing to himself what he might do to another. This comprises physical and non-physical activity. II: Verbs which normally have an inanimate object, but which may be used reflexively. These verbs do not usually show physical activity. III: Verbs with a factitive sense. In addition to these three patterns two other divisions are included: (a) verbs of emotional and nervous reaction, (b) verbs of movement. It should be noted that the author divides the verbs with inanimate subject into two classes according as they show personification or animation. Of the last two classes the author has found few examples in the Old French texts she has used, but she admits (p. 126) that this occurs particularly in the more courtly and philosophical literature.

The author finds that the majority of the Latin reflexives may be placed in the first two patterns, whereas there are few examples of pattern III, which however increases in the later periods. Attention is called to the importance of the use of reflexives in burlesque expressions by Plautus and it is suggested that it is not improbable that this usage may have continued many centuries, although the limited choice of the works studied has prevented a search for such cases, which would have merited a special study. A note concerning the reflexive in medio-passive sense might well have been further developed. It is stated that with verbs of movement the intransitive becomes reflexive. Although this is not conspicuous in the Latin texts, the writer devotes much attention to this subject in her study of the verbs of movement in Old French (pp. 101-26), which is one of the most interesting chapters of the book. The author enthusiastically concludes her study of this type with the statement that "half of all the reflexive verbs to be found in Old French are verbs of movement" (p. 125). This may be true, but one cannot help wondering on what investigation the remark is based, since relatively few Old French texts have been used in the preparation of this work.

In the chapter on the reflexives in Old French and also in the following chapter Miss Hatcher has tried to fit all the reflexives found in the works she has examined into the different categories she has constructed for her classification. She has accomplished her task with great skill and acumen, not to say subtlety at times, and has interpreted her examples with much intelligence. It is natural that occasionally different scholars might prefer other interpretations of certain examples, but for the most part I think that she has shown good judgment, even to the point of admitting that opinions might differ and that an example might be classed differently.

Her comparisons of the increase and decline of the relative number of examples in Old French and Latin is quite an interesting contribution. In pattern I, she has found few instances of physical use in Old French and she states that pattern III was seldom found. The

latter statement applies also to the Latin, but in Modern French abundant examples are attested. On the other hand, whereas reflexives expressing emotional and nervous reaction were uncommon in Latin, they occur regularly in Old French, as she has demonstrated. It is noted that most of these Old French verbs have no predecessors in Latin (p. 95).

Another interesting subject which has been developed by the investigator is contained in the section devoted to the conjugation of reflexive verbs with *être* (pp. 127-46). Although this part of the work is classed by the author as an Appendix (perhaps because it does not fit in with her scheme of classification), it seems to the reviewer to be an interesting and important contribution to the study of reflexives. Starting from such expressions as *as le vos* and *atant le vos*, she shows the rise of the use of participle + *est* employed with intransitives of motion to produce a dramatic effect. She prefers to name this a compound present, not a preterite as Foulet has called it, and then shows how the reflexive, first employed with transitive verbs of movement, became generalized even in the early Old French period. Thus she concludes that "the reflexive was given to *être* and not *être* to the reflexive." To be sure this is counter to the theories of Tobler and Meyer-Lübke, but Miss Hatcher presents her case with pertinent examples and argues her point with conviction.

In the chapter on Modern French the same classification is followed, but it is to be noted that verbs of the type of *se louer*, *se blâmer*, expressing the critical attitude of the subject towards his other self, show a considerable increase. A note on page 153 contains a good explanation of the origin of *se saisir de*. Pattern II also increases, but it is in Pattern III and in the verbs of nervous and emotional reaction, of which there were few examples in the earlier periods, that the greatest expansion is found. This increase is not surprising, when one notices the kind of works chosen as specimens of this period. In all of these authors a highly developed style is found, which naturally furnishes numerous examples of expressions of emotion. Reference has already been made to the wide development in Old French of the reflexives with verbs of motion. This shows a further increase in Modern French.

The development of the reflexive construction appears to be one of the features of style employed by modern writers. Miss Hatcher states that the intransitive is the favorite construction with the peasants, whereas artists prefer to use the reflexive. In the concluding paragraphs attention is called to the increase in the use of the reflexive for inanimate things in order to give them the semblance of life. This again is a stylistic characteristic of some Modern French writers.

It is stated that the progress of the reflexive construction from the time of the Old French to the present day may be summed up as a gradual advance in the direction of the passive, but that it does not fail to contrast with the passive. Here the author does not agree with Sandfield, *Syntaxe du français contemporain* (Paris, 1928), "le réfléchi au sens passif," although she admits that types cited by him may be possible in the popular language, with which she confesses a lack of deep familiarity (p. 201).

Throughout this investigation, which has been well conceived, the author has confined herself to the study of literary texts chosen from

three widely separated periods. The scheme of classification has been carefully constructed with perhaps not enough flexibility allowed to include examples from different types of texts and other periods. The study of the rise and development of the passive is a subject which merits much further study, which should include the other Romance Languages as well, nor should references to the Greek, particularly the use of the Middle Voice, be omitted. The field is wide and still largely untilled, but Miss Hatcher has cleared some of the ground, ploughed deeply in certain plots, and opened up vistas of new fields, which when thoroughly cleared may well yield rich harvests.

RAYMOND THOMPSON HILL.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

WILLIAM MERRITT READ. Michigan Manuscript 18 of the Gospels. Seattle, Univ. of Washington Press, 1942. Pp. ix + 75; 2 plates. (*University of Washington Publications in Language and Literature*, XI [January, 1943].)

The manuscript which Professor Read edits is a tetra-evangelion of the 12th or 13th century comprising 212 parchment folios. It is equipped with *κεφάλαια*, *τίτλοι*, Ammonian sections, and Eusebian canon numbers, as well as lectionary tables. The document is number 538 in Gregory's list and ε335 in von Soden's. The latter scholar classified the text of this MS as belonging to his K^x group, a subdivision of the Byzantine text.¹ Read discovers, however, by a study of those passages in von Soden's apparatus in which the authorities for the K text differ among themselves, that von Soden's classification of Mich. 18 is correct only for Matthew and John; in Mark and Luke its text is closer to von Soden's K¹ group.

Read's chief interest, after showing that MS 18 belongs to the late Byzantine text, is to analyze the nature of those readings which are not of the K type. He exhibits successively data regarding the affiliation of his MS with the early versions of the Gospels (the old Latin, Syriac, Coptic, and Georgian) and with various families of New Testament text thus far isolated, notably families 1, 13, 1424, and several of von Soden's groups.

This analysis gives evidence of careful and painstaking industry on the part of the author, and the remarks which follow are not to be construed as unappreciative of his labors. The chief criticism, however, which the present reviewer has of Read's textual evaluation of non-Byzantine elements in MS 18 is that he offers no control for estimating the significance of his evidence. His elaborate tables showing the agreement of Mich. 18 with various families and texts are necessary and not uninstructive, but they permit only the roughest appraisement of degrees of relationship. It would be much more revelatory if, in addition to citing agreements of his MS with other families, Read had determined the total number of, say, the Neutral,

¹ Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, I, ii (Berlin, 1907), p. 750.

Western, and Caesarean readings in several sample pericopes so that one might see exactly what proportion of readings from each of these families has passed into his MS. Thus, for instance, in Mark XI it takes but little effort to determine that the text of Westcott and Hort, which conveniently supplies a very close approximation to the Neutral text, differs from the Textus Receptus in 63 significant instances (i. e., not counting the presence or absence of *ν ἐφελκυστικόν*, *οὐτῶς* for *οὐτω*, etc.).² Now, an examination of Read's collation of Mich. 18 shows that in Mark XI his MS differs from the Textus Receptus and agrees with Westcott and Hort in five significant instances. In other words, in this chapter of Mark about eight percent of all Neutral variants from the Textus Receptus are present in Mich. 18. In a similar manner, Read could have determined precisely what proportion of readings in any other hitherto isolated text or family has passed into his MS, except that in certain of these cases he would have had to reconstruct short test sections of such characteristic texts or families from their chief witnesses.

Among the minor observations it may be mentioned that Read, in speaking of the Caesarean text of the Gospels, is obviously unaware that the status of this family is now in transition. Lagrange,³ the Lakes,⁴ and particularly Ayuso,⁵ have shown that the members of this text fall into the primitive or pre-Caesarean group and the recensional or Caesarean group proper. The former, according to Ayuso's elaborate analyses, is represented by p^{45} , W, fam. 1, fam. 13, and 28 and was localized in the Fayyum and Gizeh in Egypt. The latter is represented by Θ , 565, 700, Origen, Eusebius, Sinaitic Syriac, old Armenian, and old Georgian and emanated from Caesarea (in Palestine).⁶

Read has seen fit to pay almost exclusive attention to textual affinities and to neglect other interesting and important aspects of his document. For instance, he says nothing about the paleography of Mich. 18. An examination of this in the light of E. C. Colwell's valuable study, "Some Criteria for Dating Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts,"⁷ might have enabled him to decide whether Gregory or Clark was correct in dating his MS. Or again, Read does not indicate the extent to which the lectionary equipment agrees with

² See William Sanday's convenient collation in "Appendix I, Collatio textus Westcottio-Hortiani cum textu Stephanico anni MDL" in Charles Lloyd and William Sanday's *Novum Testamentum* (Oxford, 1889).

³ M.-J. Lagrange, "Le groupe dit césaréen des manuscrits des évangiles," *Revue Biblique*, XXXVIII (1929), pp. 481 f.; cf. *ibid.*, XLIII (1934), p. 23.

⁴ Kiropp and Silva Lake, "De Westcott et Hort au père Lagrange et au-delà," *Revue Biblique*, XLVIII (1939), pp. 497-505.

⁵ Teófilo Ayuso, "¿Texto cesariense o precesariense?" *Biblica*, XVI (1935), pp. 369-415.

⁶ For a fuller account of the present status of the so-called "Caesarean" text, see the reviewer's forthcoming article, "A Survey of Investigation of the Caesarean Text of the Gospels," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXIV (1945).

⁷ In E. C. Colwell, *The Four Gospels of Karahissar, I, History and Text* (Chicago, 1936), pp. 225-41. Colwell bases his conclusions on material derived from more than one hundred New Testament MSS dated from the ninth to the fourteenth century.

the standard Greek lectionary system. Nor does he have any remark to make concerning the illumination in his document, although a comparison with decorations in dated MSS would certainly contribute to the forming of a judgment as to its date. Likewise, when one learns from K. W. Clark's catalogue⁸ that this MS possesses several colophons, one wishes that its editor would have commented upon them, or at least would have transcribed them. This is of a piece with Read's neglect of the history of his document.

But, lest it seem that Read's honest labors are not duly appreciated, let it be said that, by making available the collation of a Gospel MS, he has put New Testament textual critics under a very real obligation to him, and it is to be hoped that his commendable and painstaking industry will encourage other scholars to do likewise.

BRUCE M. METZGER.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

ERNEST ADDISON MOODY. *Iohannis Buridani Quaestiones super Libris Quattuor de Caelo et Mundo*. Cambridge, Mass., 1942. Pp. xxxv + 274. \$4.50. (The Mediaeval Academy of America, Publ. No. 40 [*Studies and Documents*, No. 6].)

Between 1480 and 1516, eight works of Jean Buridan, Rector of the University of Paris and professor of philosophy there from at least 1328 to 1358, were edited for print; no other of his many writings, largely scholastic commentaries on Aristotle, was published until 1942. This new volume is another sign that the Renaissance spirit, which fixed the connotation of the word *dunce* and derided the *cymini sectores*, has in four centuries run its course; now the broken thread of learning is being spliced. Pierre Duhem, who at the beginning of our century taught us to believe that scholastic commentaries, far from being arid, stimulated new hypotheses in physics and astronomy, was more than a little interested in Buridan.

The description of Buridan by his colleagues as "venerable and distinguished" is two-edged. The *Quaestiones*, which no doubt typify his immense corpus, are curiously modern. The presentations have a deceptive objectivity. He represents neither his author nor the necessary problems of his time in due proportion. Aristotle's text serves only as a necessary point of departure for erudite and typically professorial digressions into such fields as catch his rather plodding curiosity. He properly mixes book-learning and argument; he clearly summarizes divergent views and points out striking insufficiencies; he draws a cogent analogy and then describes an experiment that we may guess he did not himself perform. Then he drops the question, sometimes with a strong peroration in favor of a theory of his own, which frequently enough is the prevalent theory of his day. In short, Buridan is the well-read, well-fed pedant in The University, after it passed through its evangelical youth of Aquinas, Hales, and Scotus.

⁸ *A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America* (Chicago, 1937), pp. 285 f.

and emerged into the golden middle age of restraint and disorder. If here and there Buridan's remarks seem unique and anticipatory, we may hazard the guess that he has derived them from some more lively but less expressive intelligence. Though readers of Roger Bacon may question the editor's claim that "the constant preference for mechanical rather than metaphysical explanations of the dynamic order of the universe reveal the profound difference between the intellectual atmosphere of the mid fourteenth century and that of the thirteenth," unquestionably the scholastic vocabulary on which our own concepts are substantially founded was so shaped in the interval that Buridan's text has the flavor of modernity. It constantly tempts the reader into attributing to him a profundity that he surely did not possess.

The text has been constructed from photographic reproductions of two manuscripts, Munich 19551 (possibly written in 1378 at Prague or Vienna), and Bruges 477 (saec. XIV²), identified in 1927 by Abbé Michalski. Moody considers the Bruges text "more consistently 'Buridianic.'" Spelling has been normalized to "the so-called 'classical orthography,'" and variants have in the main been limited to full words or more. Despite a noteworthy difference between the two manuscripts, we may assume that both derive from Buridan's own text, not from student's notes. The editor is to be congratulated on the cleanliness of the text; his paragraphing and numbering are definite aids to the reader. The Introduction contains an unpretentious but helpful statement about the author and his works and a good summary of the material of the *Quaestiones*. The description of manuscripts is unnecessarily long and repetitious; the sources marked are only the more obvious ones (largely references to Aristotle and Averroes); and the index is skimpy and unpredictable.

Students may challenge the choice of Buridan's work for editing when so much in the period needs to be done—Oecam, for instance. But we are really in no position to judge until more texts are available. Moody and other recent writers have maintained that a body of new thought flowed from Buridan through Albert of Saxony to Leonardo and even to Galileo. The reviewer guesses that Buridan so satisfactorily represents the academic average of a most important period that his works form a safe basis for preliminary generalization. Historians who have built on anecdotes like that of Galileo and the Tower of Pisa will learn something of the continuity of science by reading here. Buridan's discussions of gravitational acceleration, with his theory of *impetus*, his concept of space, and his mechanical explanations of celestial movement are neither Aristotelian nor Newtonian, but they are a perfectly reasonable station along the way.

At the risk of disproportion, I cite an instance to illustrate. The seventh question of the second book, "Utrum tota terra sit habitabilis," discusses the relation of the spheres of earth and water. Moody has previously (*Speculum*, XVI, pp. 415-25) noted its unique approach to the problem of soil erosion. The prevalent theory, inherited from Arabic commentators, of concentric elemental spheres from earth in the center through water to air and fire, was meeting with some skepticism in the fourteenth century, for obviously the sphere of water does not envelope the sphere of earth. Buridan first cites the

explanation of eccentricity. After interposing a number of objections, he reasons that the gravities of earth and water are not eccentric, but that the magnitudes are. Since, he says, earth is not homogeneous in weight, but water is, then the centers of magnitude need not be the same. He links his theory with a doctrine of constant shift, which we would call isostasy, and in that way accounts for apparent stability despite erosion. This theory was caught up by Albert of Saxony, Themon Judaeus, and Nicolas Oresme, and writers of the fifteenth century (Thorndike, *Hist.*, III, p. 580).

But Buridan is not the head-link in the chain. Dante's *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra*, which deals exclusively with this problem of the spheres of earth and water, accords considerable favor to Ristoro d'Arezzo's theory, inspired by a remark of Averroes, of the influence of the stellar heaven; but then Dante (I assume there is no longer a question about his authorship) rejects it for a deistic distinction between the virtues of universal and particular nature. Paradoxically he inserts (XVII) a "rejoinder" which he shortly rejects as "futile": ". . . licet terra sit gravissimum corpus comparatum ad alia corpora; comparatum tamen in se, scilicet in suas partes, potest esse gravissimum et non gravissimum; quia posset esse gravior terra ex una parte quam ex altera. Nam quum adaequatio corporis gravis non fiat per quantitatem, in quantum quantitas, sed per pondus; poterit ibi esse adaequatio ponderis, quod non sit ibi adaequatio quantitatis."

The question of the position of the spheres had not seriously troubled 13th-century philosophers (cf. Norlind in *Lunds Årsskrift*, Humanistiska Am., N. F. XIV, p. 12). Neckham and Bacon disregard it; it is little more than a theological query in Albertus Magnus. Ristoro, who in 1282 accented the question, favored an astrological solution. Less than forty years later the question was so commonplace that Dante, who was a popular, not a scholarly, student of science, prepared a public disputation, rejecting with some qualms the astrological explanation for one somewhat more theological. In the course of his reasoning he caught up in unassimilated form an explanation that even then was no doubt being molded into a philosophical tenet, which Buridan within a generation presented to his advanced class at Paris. From such classes the theory developed, with constantly new applications, until it appears in the writings of Leonardo as an explanation for the presence of sea fossils high in the mountains.

It is perhaps not too commonplace to conclude that only when we have a succession of texts like this contribution of Dr. Moody's shall we have an undistorted image of the progress of science and thought in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

CHARLES W. JONES.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

Cicero, *Brutus*, with an English translation by G. L. HENDRICKSON; *Orator*, with an English translation by H. M. HUBBELL. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press; London, William Heinemann, 1939. Pp. v + 538. (The Loeb Classical Library.)

In both its contributions this book is of high quality, and will rank among the better volumes of the Loeb Library. Since neither *Brutus* nor *Orator* has hitherto been satisfactorily translated into English, students of the doctrine and history of ancient eloquence will welcome these renderings, which are accurate and sound, and a delight to read.

The virtues of Professor Hendrickson's own style are *subtilitas* and *elegantia*, and the power to reproduce in English the vivacity of the original Latin. Lapses are very few, and exceedingly few also are the interpretations to which one would more than mildly object. In § 20 *Sed illa, cum poteris atque ut possis, rogo* ("But I do not insist on that now; when you can, and as you can, is all that I crave") must, it seems to me, be punctuated with a comma or semicolon after *poteris* ("But that work you will write when you are able, and I ask you to resolve that you shall be able!"); 44: *Pericles . . . primus adhibuit doctrinam*, "first to apply theory" rather than "first to be influenced by theoretical study" (see Martha's note); 265: "how carefully he weighed every word he uttered" rather than "how nothing ill-considered proceeded from his lips"; 325: *quorum utriusque orationes sunt*, "the speeches of both are" rather than "both of whose speeches are"; in 8 there is an intrusive *them*; in a few sentences a plural subject takes a singular verb (156, 276, 285); misprints: *uco* for *fuco* in text at 162, *Messalla* with one *l* at 328. The force of Hendrickson's style derives, in some part, from his readiness to break up long Ciceronian sentences when the English idiom and rhythm suggest the practice. The text he regards as well preserved; he shows his conservatism by keeping several readings which some editors have regarded as interpolations in L (e. g., 197: *aut exspectaret*; 222: *id est a iudiciis*). The reading *collegae* (58) should, I think, have been referred to Piderit and Jahn-Kroll, *sic tamquam* (71) to the editor who first so read the text (Meyer?). Of Hendrickson's own emendations, the insertion of *arte* (327) must be accounted clever, whether or not it will be accepted by subsequent editors; the bracketing of *-que* in L's *mortuo viverent-que* (330) provides, despite the asyndeton, as good a solution as Stangl's transposition of L's reading, which is accepted by Reis and Martha, and a more likely one than the common editorial reading *mortuoque viverent*. Hendrickson's Introduction is especially good for its discussion of Cicero's motives and purposes in writing the *Brutus*, and for its critical comments on the *Essay*.

Professor Hubbell faced harder textual problems, and a harder task of translation (see, e. g., the straggling Latin sentence at 73-4). He must be credited with having accomplished his task in a neat, dexterous, and expert manner. Here, too, inapt or inexact locutions are extremely few—"others" for "other," 122; an awkward sentence in 203, and careless phrasing in 206; a confusing excess of dashes in

227, and at 93, "different than"; at 60 and 77 there are plural subjects with singular verbs, and misprints at 94 and in the note on p. 347. I would suggest that the Greek equivalent of the figure *conclusio* (137, note h) may be *συμπέρασμα*, and not *συλλογισμός*, which is used rather as the name for the type of issue called *ratiocinatio* (Reasoning from Analogy). Hubbell's footnotes, especially on the figures of speech, will prove very useful to students; I wish he had added the names of those figures which follow immediately upon *conduplicatio* in the list at 135. For making his text he himself collated five of the important MSS; the apparatus for *Orator* is fuller than for *Brutus*. He tells us that an editor must choose between two readings on the basis of probability. It is interesting accordingly to study Hubbell's deviations from Reis, and one concludes that the Loeb editor has usually chosen well.

HARRY CAPLAN.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

ALVAR ERIKSON. (1) *Sancti Epiphanii Episcopi Interpretatio Evangeliorum*. Pp. xvi + 182. (2) *Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Epiphanius' Interpretatio Evangeliorum*. Lund, Gleerup, 1939. Pp. xvi + 147.

The collection of the homilies of St. Epiphanius is here edited for the first time, and the pioneering work done by Dom Morin and Dom Inguanez advanced and brought to fruition. Erikson follows Morin in accepting the attribution, made in several of the MSS, to Epiphanius, but cannot determine Epiphanius' identity. He does, however, set a general date for the work—the end of the fifth century or the beginning of the sixth. The degree to which the Latin forms have broken down makes this conclusion probable. Further, Erikson has discovered that a passage in the homilies is borrowed, almost in the precise words, from one of the Epistles falsely ascribed to Sulpicius Severus. Since it is reasonable to assume that this letter did not precede Sulpicius in time, and that the writer did not borrow from Epiphanius, we may with Erikson accept the fifth century as the *terminus non ante quem* for the time of Epiphanius.

These homilies are in their inorganic form typical of the early Middle Ages. A text from Scripture is expounded in a simple and familiar way, yet often with a profusion of other Biblical passages used in support. The aim is instruction and exhortation; and the method of interpretation is largely allegorical—Samson lost seven locks of hair, which contained all his *virtus*, and these locks represent the septiform spirit of Christ (Ch. 8). Of rhetorical devices Epiphanius shows fondness for antithesis, simile, interrogation, and exclamation.

The editor methodically describes the MSS and appraises them in relation to one another. The best MSS belong to *saecc.* ix and x. He is forced to use an eclectic method in the choice of readings, for, as he reports, none of these better MSS is so bad that it does not, as against all the other MSS, contain at least one correct reading, and none is so good as to have escaped the intrusion of errors. He not

only supplies, in an *apparatus*, the variant readings of the MSS used in constructing the text, but also, at the end of the volume, lists those of the other MSS. The result of his labor is a sound, excellent text.

The volume of *Bemerkungen* is a product of the same first-rate scholarship. Here the arrangement is in grammatical categories, of the kind we have come to expect in studies of the school of Löfstedt. This scheme gives Erikson the opportunity not only to discuss the many specific points of linguistic interest, but to make important observations of a general nature that should, together with the Bibliography, prove most helpful to students of the language and literature of this period. The singling out of individual items for illustration seems not called for here. Erikson manages also to support convincingly decisions he has made on difficult points in the text. What few doubts were raised in the reviewer's examination of the text proved to be anticipated or resolved in Erikson's treatment of these passages in the *Bemerkungen*. The homilies are indeed more significant for their language than for their excellence as sermon-literature. Their language represents about the same general stage of development as that of the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* and of the *Regula Benedicti*.

Epiphanius frequently quotes Scripture from memory. Of the Old-Testament books he most often cites the Psalms. The Bible-text used by him antedates the Vulgate, and is obviously inferior to it in energy and spirit.

HARRY CAPLAN.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

W. J. SEDGEFIELD. *Locorum nonnullorum in epistulis M. T. Ciceronis mendose descriptorum emendationes. Editio tertia.* London, 1943. Pp. 16.

The pamphlet under review most assuredly presents *multum in parvo*. After a brief Foreword (p. 3), followed by notes, a table of MSS, and a brief bibliography (p. 4), the author gives us in less than twelve pages seventy-nine new emendations or interpretations of the text of Cicero's *Letters*. The discussion has been abbreviated "for economic reasons"; this is unfortunate, for in many of the passages the author fails to do justice to his material; a fuller treatment of the passages in their context would be desirable, especially since some of the corruptions have already been healed to the satisfaction of most modern editors. In these instances, particularly, Sedgefield should have explained why the new readings are necessary or how they provide a better text, but this he fails to do. The very brevity of the pamphlet increases the difficulty for a reviewer, for an adequate discussion of the new emendations would require many times the space which Sedgefield used for the presentation of his material.

The corrupt state of the text of Cicero's *Letters* is common knowledge. Sedgefield believes that our MSS go back to one "original," the work of a careless and ignorant copyist, "a man almost ignorant of Latin and probably of Greek." This copyist, writing in uncials,

frequently lost his place and "omitted many of the identical letter-groups which abound in a Latin text." This is Sedgefield's hypothesis which he believes accounts for the more serious corruptions in the text. His method of emending may best be stated in his own words (p. 3):

In our investigation of these passages we began by writing some of them out in uncials, without word-division, as we have reason to believe they were written in the earliest stages. Soon it became apparent that if in a passage certain letter-groups were repeated, either in juxtaposition or separated by other letters in the passage, an intelligible reading was obtained. We thereupon tried this method upon all the other corrupt passages, with the unexpected result that in most cases the passages yielded a straightforward, unstrained meaning which fitted the context and conformed to Cicero's epistolary style. There was no question here of 'ingenuity'; on the restoration of the missing letters the meaning emerged automatically, so to speak.

This is the method which Sedgefield has used in over forty¹ of the corrupt passages, and which he believes has produced a good text in each case.

The following are some of the simplest illustrations of his method, and are, in my opinion, among his more successful conjectures. 4.² *tribuam tribum* for *tribum* (*Att.*, II, 14, 2). 8. *quae querant* for *quae erant* (*Att.*, V, 20, 1). 13. *exilis illa* for *exilla* (*Att.*, VII, 8, 5). 19. *αὐτοῦ ἡγεμόνος* for *authemonis* (*Att.*, VIII, 15, 1); Tyrrell-Purser favor here the suggestion of Winstedt, *αὐθῆμερον*. 33. *oppriimi nimia malitia* for *oppriimi militia* (*Att.*, XIII, 22, 4). But *nimia* here seems unnecessary, for the -MI of *oppriimi* would account for the MILITIA of the MSS; *malitia* is the reading of Wesenberg and Tyrrell-Purser, but Tyrrell-Purser consider *malitia* an ablative, not a nominative. 45. *devertissemque qua citius* for *devertissemque acutius* (*Att.*, XV, 2, 1). 47. *villaeque plures vi defendendae* for *ut illeque plures videndae* (*Att.*, XV, 8, 2). *villaeque* is the reading of Wesenberg and Tyrrell-Purser; *vi defendendae* seems a particularly good suggestion. 50. *ut ais tutius ancoram* for *ut ais coram* (*Att.*, XV, 19, 1); but cf. Reid, *Hermathena*, XII (1903), p. 163. 58. *habebatur hebetior* for *habebatur* (*Att.*, XVI, 1, 4), also good. 63. *quid egerit elice liceat* for *quid egerit liceat* (*Fam.*, XVI, 23, 1), a neat example of Sedgefield's method, but modern editors agree here on *quod egerit liceat*.³ 69. *incili in Cilicia iam* for *incilicia* and *adhuc haeserunt* for *adhaeserunt* (*Fam.*, VIII, 5, 3). Most editors follow Manutius and read *incili iam*; Sedgefield says that this does not account for the CIA of the MS. 74. *iam eximiae artis* for *iam ex artis* (*Fam.*, IX, 20, 2), which seems better than *iam exquisitae*

¹ The number is Sedgefield's (p. 3); actually the method is used at least fifty times. The remaining emendations "are of minor errors . . . which do not result from the omission of similar letter-groups" (p. 4).

² The arabic numerals refer in each case to Sedgefield's numbering of the emended passages.

³ Cf. C. A. Lehmann, *De Ciceronis ad Atticum epistulis* (1892), pp. 197 ff.; Tyrrell-Purser (No. 754), *ad loc.*

artis, read by Tyrrell-Purser. 78. *silva viridi dicata* for *silva virdicata* (*Q. fr.*, III, 1, 3), an improvement upon earlier emendations, such as *viridi auctiam* (Boot) and *viridi iuncta* (Georges).

Sedgefield (p. 4) calls attention to Nos. 6, 27, and 43 as illustrating his method and its results. No. 27 is plausible: *apud epistolas tollas velim et passim animadvertis for apud epistolas velim ut possim adversas* (*Att.*, XI, 25, 3). No. 43 is a good example of the method, but not very convincing; he reads *de Pharaonum nummorum rumore puteolano* for *de Pherionum more puteolano* (*Att.*, XIV, 14, 1). No. 6, on *Att.*, V, 3, 3, seems among his least successful conjectures. It is far too ingenious and departs from his own requirement that a good emendation "should introduce as few new letters as possible" (p. 4). For *diligentia esse satisfaciemus* he reads *diligentia egentissimis semissibus ibi usitatis satisfaciemus*.⁴ Equally ingenious is his attempt to introduce a pun into *Att.*, XIII, 52, 1 (No. 39), where he expands *de Mamurra non mutavit* to *de Mamurra nam murram non mutavit*, admitting that "we cannot hope to reproduce the pun in English." Jests are introduced also into *Att.*, XIII, 20, 4 (No. 32), *Att.*, XVI, 11, 1 (No. 61), and into *Att.*, IV, 18, 4 (No. 5), where he accepts the play on *Lex Papia* and *Paphia*, although Tyrrell-Purser (No. 154) say that "such a joke would be very poor and far-fetched."

Several of the emendations of this type call for special comment. In *Att.*, XV, 18, 2 (No. 49) Sedgefield reads *ludorum sumptuosorum sumptu tuo curam* for *ludorum suorum curam*. Lehmann's suggestion of *sumptuosorum* for *suorum* (adopted by Mueller and Purser) he does not consider sufficient. But how would Sedgefield account for the loss of both *sumptuo-* and *sumptu tuo*? *Att.*, I, 16, 13 (No. 1) is similar; he reads *fabulam vel mimum* for *fabam mimum*, and assumes the loss of both VL and VEL. Neither Mueller, Purser, nor Sjögren marks the passage as corrupt, and the presence of *famam mimum* in Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis*, 9 tends to confirm the traditional reading of the Ciceronian passage.⁵ In No. 14 the reading of *illudes aliud desideras* for *illud desideras* (*Att.*, VIII, 2, 3) does not account for the lacuna of sixteen letters in M. In *Att.*, XV, 1a, 2 (No. 44) *cognomine tuo lapsus* is expanded to *cognomine tuo volup usus*, "exulting in your cognomen." Sedgefield refers to *volup* as an archaism "chiefly found in Plautus, of whose language Cicero's letters are often reminiscent." But Plautus uses *volup* only with *esse* or *facere*, with the single exception of *Most.*, 153, *victitabam volup*. The phrase *volup uti*, "to exult in," seems definitely non-Plautine. Modern editors do not mark the Ciceronian passage corrupt. The troublesome reference in *Fam.*, VII, 5, 2 (No. 67) to *Mitfuium* becomes *M. T. filium Licinium*; but *T. filium* should follow the *nomen*,

⁴ Cf. L.-A. Constans, *Cicéron, Correspondance*, III (Paris, 1936), p. 211, who reads *diligentia r. p. satis faciemus*.

⁵ There has been considerable discussion of the passage, however. Cf. e. g. Rossbach, *B. p. W.*, XXXIII (1913), p. 1310, who reads *fabulam mimum*; see Harmon, *B. p. W.*, XXXIV (1914), pp. 702 f., Krohn, *B. p. W.*, XXXVI (1916), p. 1015, Münzer, *ibid.*, pp. 1316 ff. Tyrrell-Purser suggest reading *fabulam* and deleting *mimum* as a gloss. On Constans' reading, *fabam imam*, see *Rev. Phil.*, LIV (1928), pp. 212 f.

and *filium* is usually abbreviated when so used. In No. 36 (*Att.*, XIII, 40, 1) Sedgefield's reading of *sensus perdidit* for *se suspendit* is neat but quite unnecessary,⁶ and that of *ut stultum est* for *ut fultum est* was suggested by Tunstall. In *Att.*, XVI, 11, 1 (No. 60) Sedgefield changes *sine vallo Luciliano* to *sine ullo alio Luciliano*; this is better than *allo* alone (suggested by Turnebus), for it explains the *vallo* of the MSS. Sedgefield expands *alterum manuunt nos utrumque* in *Att.*, VIII, 11, 3 (No. 17) to *alterum amant alterum metuunt nos utrumque*. Mueller, Purser (Oxford C. T.), Tyrrell-Purser, and Sjögren all read merely *metuunt* for *manuunt* and Tyrrell-Purser explain *manuunt* by the proximity of *remansimus*. Neither Sedgefield's expansion nor his interpretation of *nos utrumque* seems plausible; is it likely that Cicero would say "we love and fear both (Pompey and Caesar)"? In *Att.*, XV, 7 (No. 46) Sedgefield's suggestion *tum cum metu* for *cum tum* destroys the balanced structure of the sentence and seems less plausible than Reid's conjecture of *tum consilium* in *Hermathena*, XII (1903), p. 154.

Of the emendations of minor errors (see above, note 1), the following are attractive: 9. *transitum* for *transitam* (*Att.*, V, 21, 5); Sedgefield might have added that *transitum* is the reading of N; 21. *deflendam* for *defendam* (*Att.*, IX, 10, 6); 24. *recte fiet* for *recitet et* (*Att.*, X, 6, 1); 31. *doctius* for *octius* (*Att.*, XII, 46, 1), if *doctius* can mean "more philosophically (borne)"; Cicero, *Brut.*, 25 does not seem a good parallel;⁷ 34. *D effecti* for *deffecti* (*Att.*, XIII, 23, 2), "500 copies are ready"; 71. *ortum* for *hortum* (*Fam.*, IX, 4), "early morning sun."⁸ Other conjectures of this type, however, appear questionable or unnecessary: 11. *quid nominis* seems no improvement upon *quid hominis*, accepted by editors in *Att.*, VII, 3, 9. 56. Sedgefield reads *decore et a patre* for *de ore et patre* (*Att.*, XV, 29, 2); cf. Tyrrell-Purser (No. 768), who see no reason here for emendation. 62. How is the form *consentii*, "I have agreed," possible for *consenti* (*Att.*, XVI, 15, 6)? Does Sedgefield mean *consensi*? 76. *latitum* seems unnecessary in *Fam.*, XIII, 77, 3: editors accept *laturum* without comment. In *Fam.*, IX, 6, 6 (No. 72) Sedgefield emends *iure* to *in re* or *tua re*, although Gurlitt's defense of *iure*⁹ is accepted by Sjögren. In other instances also Sedgefield suggests more than one possible emendation, e. g. Nos. 25 (*Att.*, X, 12, 5), 75 (*Fam.*, IX, 22, 1), and 10 (*Att.*, VI, 1, 23), where he reads *protulit in lucem Lucceius* for *potuit Lucceius*, but says that *in lucem* is not indispensable to the sense of the passage.

In spite of Sedgefield's rather naive admission (p. 4) "that some

⁶ Cf. Tyrrell-Purser (No. 660), *ad loc.*, who interpret thus: "But where will he find them? Unless, indeed, he hangs himself (and goes to join them in the other world)."

⁷ Modern editors accept Schmidt and read *occulitus*; but cf. Frank, *A. J. P.*, LV (1934), pp. 77 f., who suggests *ώστεος*; Post, *ibid.*, p. 224, prefers *οἰστέος*.

⁸ The editors do not mark *Fam.*, IX, 4 corrupt; cf. *Q. fr.*, II, 8, 4: *hortus domi est*. Tucker (*Hermathena*, XV [1909], p. 281) reads *χόπτον* in *Fam.*, IX, 4 and *χόπτος* in *Q. fr.*, II, 8, 4.

⁹ L. Gurlitt, *Philol.*, LXII (1903), p. 89. Gurlitt's treatment of the passage is approved by Sternkopf, *Jahresbericht*, CXXXIX (1908), p. 61.

of these emendations may have already been put forward by others," it is surprising to find that he suggests as his own several readings which are mentioned in the critical notes of standard editions (e. g. Mueller, Purser) or in the critical apparatus of the Oldfather-Canter-Abbott Index.¹⁰ The following readings of Sedgefield have already been suggested by others: *Att.*, VIII, 4, 1 (No. 16): *veritatem veritus* for *veritus* (Kean, *C. R.*, XXXII [1918], p. 171); Sjögren accepts the use of the genitive with *vereor* and does not mark the passage corrupt; *Att.*, XII, 3, 2 (No. 29): *C. Lupo* for *clypo* (Turnebus, *apud* Clark, *Philol.*, LX [1901], p. 212); *Att.*, XIII, 34 (No. 35): *plane* for *paene* (Moser, *apud* Mueller, *ad loc.*); *Att.*, XV, 20, 1 (No. 51): *ante nos* for *anteno* (Corradus; Reid, *apud* Tyrrell-Purser, *ad loc.*; Clark, *Philol.*, LX [1901], p. 204); in *Att.*, XI, 25, 3 (No. 28), *miserrimae facilitate* for *miserumea facultate* is already read by Tyrrell-Purser (2nd ed.); *facilitate* was earlier suggested by Schiche and by Reid; cf. also Purser in *Essays and Studies Presented to Wm. Ridgeway* (1913), p. 79.

I have tried, in this brief discussion, to summarize Sedgefield's method and its results; in general he seems far too confident of his theory of omitted letter-groups, and in many instances he fails to show a grasp of the problems involved. Many of his suggestions will doubtless be rejected, and properly so; others deserve careful consideration and may well provide the solution of difficulties which have been the despair of previous editors. All students of the text of Cicero's *Letters* should examine Sedgefield's restorations; unfortunately, his work is marred by many inaccuracies and omissions in both references and readings, and I append a list of the errors which I have noted, that other readers will not be misled by the same inaccuracies. 1. Read *Att.* I. 16. 13 for *Att.* I. 16. 3; *mimum* is the reading of *M*³, not *M*¹; *M*¹ has *minimum*.¹¹ 3. Delete *orationem* and insert *mihi* after *libebat*. 4. Add *frequentia Formianorum* after *villam*. 5. Read *maiestatis*, not *maiestati*. 7. Read *Att.* XI. 7. 1 for *Att.* V. 7. 1. 8. *M* reads *oppidis*, not *in oppidis*. 17. The MSS read *qui*, not *quidem*; both Mueller and Sjögren give the reading of *M* as *nostrumque*, not as *nos utrumque*. 20. *M* reads *illa estvia*, not *illa aestvia*. 21. Read *Att.* IX. 10. 6 for *Att.* IX. 19. 6. 23. *M*² has *quod exemplum*. 31. Add *tantum* after *manebit*. 32. Read *ago* for *ego*. 41. *M* in *Att.*, XIV, 10, 3 reads *πιξόθεμν magnum*, not *πισόθεμν magnum*.¹² 43. *M* reads *Pherionum*; *Pharionum* was suggested by Boot. 47. *M* reads *illeque*, not *illaque*. 52. *M* reads *scire quo die Olympia cum mysteria scilicet ut*, not *scire quo die olim piaculum ut*. 53. *M* reads *Caerellia*, not *Carelliae*. 54. Read *ei tamen* before *confirmem*. 57. Read *Att.* XV. 20. 2 for *Att.* XV. 29. 2. 61. *M* has *asta ea*, not *ista ea*. 63. Read *Fam.* XVI. 23. 1 for *Att.* XVI. 23. 1.

¹⁰ W. A. Oldfather, H. V. Canter, K. M. Abbott, *Index Verborum Ciceronis Epistularum* (Urbana, 1938). See especially pp. 17-97 (Additamentum ad apparatus criticum), which are invaluable to all students of the text of the *Letters*.

¹¹ For the readings of *M*, I have consulted Mueller, Purser (Oxford C. T.), Tyrrell-Purser (2nd ed.), Sjögren, and Constans. I regret that it was impossible to examine *M* in facsimile.

¹² This makes Sedgefield's expansion to *ώρισε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῖν* somewhat less plausible.

64. Read Att. XII. 32. 1 for Att. XVI. 32. 8; M reads *nollem*, not *nolim*, which was suggested by Schütz. 67. M reads *Mitfiuum*, not *Mitfinium*. 68. The reading of M in *Fam.*, VIII, 2, 1 is *repraesentare*, not *repraesentante*; cf. Constans, *Rev. Phil.*, LIV (1928), p. 201. 69. *Iam* is part of the emendation of Manutius and does not appear in M. 73. *Sanniorum* is the reading of H, not of M. 76. Read *Fam.* XIII. 77. 3 for *Fam.* XIII. 77. 2. In note 2 (p. 4) the numeral 20 should probably be 21. In Sjögren's articles in *Eranos*, read pp. 111 ff. after (1913), also pp. 1 ff. after (1916); the page reference to the 1919 article should be merely pp. 118 ff., instead of pp. 118 and 143.

GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN. *Plato's Theology*. Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Press, 1942. Pp. ix + 201. \$2.50. (*Cornell Studies in Classical Philology*, XXVII.)

Classicists have always been reluctant to connect the word theology with Greek thought and Plato especially. Yet it was Plato who probably coined the word and was certainly the first to use it for the accounts given of the Gods by the Greek poets (*Republic* 379 A). To him the theology of the poets, however, represented only the first stage of an intellectual development which led to the speculation of the Presocratics and finally to his own philosophy (*Laws* X, 886 B; cf. Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 983 b 28; 1091 a 34 ff.; *On Philosophy*, frags. 6 ff. [Rose], etc.). Thus his pupil Aristotle uses the word *θεολογική* for what later came to be called metaphysics or the "theoretical science of eternal, immutable and separable Being" (*Met.* 1026 a 19; 1064 b 3). We have to distinguish therefore between (1) the theology of the poets and (2) the theology of the philosophers, in addition to which there is (3) the theology implied in the civic religion and in the laws of the city-state.¹

In view of the paramount importance of the theological aspect for an adequate understanding of Plato's philosophy, it is highly

¹ Aëtius, *Placita*, I, 6, 9 in Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, p. 295: *οἱ τὸν περὶ τῶν θεῶν παραδόντες σεβασμὸν διὰ τριῶν ἐξέθηκαν ἡμῖν εἰδῶν, πρῶτον μὲν τοῦ φυσικοῦ, δεύτερον δὲ τοῦ μνήμονοῦ, τρίτον δὲ τοῦ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐκ τῶν νόμων εἰληφότες*. The same distinction occurs in M. Terentius Varro (*Rerum Div.*, I, frags. 6 f., Agahd = Augustinus, *Civ. Dei*, VI, 5; IV, 27): "Mythicorum appellant, quo maxime utuntur poetae; *physicon* [“naturale,” “naturalis theologia”], quo philosophi; *civile*, quo populi." This formulation goes back to the Platonizing Stoic source (E. Zeller, *Philos. d. Griechen*, III a⁵, pp. 586, 698) which many scholars like to call Posidonius. But the idea was already familiar to Plato's Academy as Aristotle shows who (e. g. in *Met.* 1074 b 1) distinguishes the philosophical conception of the Gods from the mythical accounts given of the Gods by the ancient "theologians" in order to "persuade" the people and for the benefit of the "laws" (cf. 995 a 5; 1000 a 9, etc.). A similar view is suggested by Plato in the *Timaeus* (40 E) and especially in the *Laws* (e. g. 904 A, *οἱ κατὰ νόμου ὄντες θεοί*).

gratifying that Solmsen has ventured to write this, the first special study on the subject. The author begins with a historical discussion of the "Background" of Plato (pp. 3-59) in which he deals with the "Religion of the City State" (pp. 3-14), its "Destruction" (pp. 15-37), and its "Defense and Reconstruction" (pp. 38-59). This discussion of the background is focused on the civic religion. The reason for this limitation becomes clear in the subsequent discussion of Plato's own treatment of the subject in the second section: "A Variety of Approaches" (pp. 63-127). According to Solmsen, Plato in his earlier dialogues, including the *Republic*, was content merely to suggest "Expurgations" of civic religion (Chap. IV, pp. 63-74); whereas in the later dialogues he gives his own reconstruction of religion, which is characterized by Solmsen as a "Philosophy of Movement" (Chap. V, pp. 75-97). In this chapter the author's thesis is that for Plato "God is not an Idea nor are his Ideas Gods" (p. 89) and that the soul as the "source of movement" is "the divine principle" (pp. 78, 90, 98, 103; cf. p. 113). This point of view he finds expressed also in the *Timaeus* (Chap. VI: "The Teleological Approach" pp. 98-122). In the next chapter he deals with "The Influence of The Mystery-Religions" which in his opinion Plato considered merely as "imagery" (pp. 123-7; cf. p. 131). The last section of the book ("The Comprehensive Picture," Chaps. VIII-X, pp. 131-74) is devoted to the Tenth Book of the *Laws*, a discussion which the author regards as "the last and comprehensive picture" of Plato's theology: "The concept of a divine World Soul as the fountain of movements is the cornerstone of the whole new system . . . Plato's philosophical religion rests on a new alliance between the State and Religion" (p. 162). Chapter X deals especially with "The Philosophy of Natural Law" (pp. 161-74) and in the "Conclusion" the influence of Plato on later philosophical thought is outlined (pp. 175-95).

Thus nearly half of the book is concerned with topics which have only a loose connection with the main problem. And in the author's exposition of Plato's theology there are many statements which rest upon a controversial interpretation of Plato's philosophy. Solmsen depends largely on the Tenth Book of the *Laws* to establish his thesis. This book gives the "prelude" to the "law concerning impiety (asebeia)" (*Laws* 907 D ff.). In the *Laws*, however, Plato obviously deals with "the Gods ordained by laws" (*ibid.* 984 A, quoted in note 1), i. e., with the gods of civic religion. Even the "preludes" to the laws are only *παραμυθιαῖ*, intended to "persuade" the people and to be used "exactly like poems" in the education of the youths (*ibid.* 720 ff. and 811 D f. [Loeb Classical Library]). It is therefore misleading to look to them as Solmsen (p. 158) does for an adequate presentation of Plato's "scientific" thought.

In his interpretation of Plato's philosophy and theology the author joins those modern scholars who deny that for Plato the Idea of Good is God. It is true that Plato never expressly calls this, his ultimate principle, God. But it should be remembered that he carefully avoids speaking about this Idea at all, so that his contemporaries ridiculed him because of his mystic "silence" about the *agathon* (Plutarch, *Dion*, XIV; Amphis, frags. 6 and 147 [Kock, II, p. 237]; Alexis, frag. 152 [Kock, II, p. 353]; cf. Plato, *Epist.*, VII, 341 B;

Phaedr. 276 A; *Phileb.* 30 C; *Tim.* 28 C, etc.). The only passage where he expounds this principle occurs in the *Republic* (504 ff.), and even here he does so by means of a simile. Yet if the sun which Plato regards as the highest god in the perceptible world is the "offspring" and "likeness" of the *agathon* (508 A ff.), the *agathon* itself must also be God. And what else can an ultimate, everlasting principle be for a Greek philosopher except a god? Of course not God in our sense, but in the Greek sense of the word. For the Greek philosopher "God is a kind of principle" (Aristotle, *Met.* 983 a 8), "something eternal which is substance" (*ibid.* 1074 a 25, cf. 1072 b 28, 1073 a 23, and 1074 b 1 ff. in note 1 *supra*). And again, "the highest divinity must be entirely immutable because it is the first and highest principle" (Aristotle, *De Caelo* 279 a 32 [Loeb Class. Library]). True, this is Aristotle's formulation, but we know that he took it from Plato's *Republic*.² None of Plato's pupils ever doubted that the "Good"—or the "One"—was his "primary God."³ I find it difficult to believe that modern scholars under the influence of present day prejudices should understand Plato better than his pupils who attended his lectures "On the Good" and who based their presentation of the problem on their notes (Simplicius, *Phys.*, pp. 151, 6 and 453, 25 [Diels]; cf. Aristotle in Aristoxenus, *Harm. Elem.*, II, p. 30, Meibom). Aristotle in closely following Plato's words (*Rep.* 504 ff.) calls the *agathon* "the most exact measure of all things" (frag. 79, Rose = Walzer, p. 99: πάντων γὰρ ἀκριβέστατον μέτρον τάγαθόν ἔστιν); in the *Laws* (IV, 716 C) Plato himself defines God as "the measure of all things" (ὁ θεὸς ἡμῖν πάντων χρημάτων μέτρον ἀγαθοῦ εἴη μάλιστα). And even the other Ideas (as Forms of "Being") although certainly inferior "in dignity and power" (*Rep.* 509 B) are called "divine" by Plato since they are eternal and immortal;⁴ for "when a Greek says immortal he says god: they are

² Aristotle, frag. 49, Rose (*Dialog. Frag.*, ed. Walzer, p. 80) where Aristotle paraphrases Plato's *Republic* 380 D. Aristotle then was not of the opinion that Plato in these passages was expurgating civic religion rather than giving a distinct, philosophical theology. Furthermore, Aristotle in another fragment (49, Rose = Walzer, p. 100) says that "God is either Nous or something even beyond Nous" (ὁ θεὸς ἡ νοῦς ἡ ἐπέκεινά τι τοῦ νοῦ). There he evidently paraphrases *Republic* 509 B where Plato says that "Good is still beyond Being (or Nous)" (οὐκ οὐσίας ὅντος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, ἀλλ' ἔτι ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας). W. Jaeger in his *Paideia* (II, pp. 414 f.) uses the same argument in his criticism of Solmsen's thesis.

³ Xenocrates, in his "paraphrase" (*μεταπέφρακεν*) of Plato's theology, says that the "One" which has the rank of "father and monarch in Heaven" is called Zeus and Nous and is the "primary god" (*πρώτος θεός*: frag. 15, Heinze = Aëtius, *Plac.*, I, 7, 30; cf. frag. 18; Speusippus, frag. 37 ff., Lang; Heracleides Pont., pp. 61 f., Voss). Aristotle's fragments and those of the other pupils of Plato give us important information on Plato's theology. Unfortunately Solmsen did not make any use of this invaluable source of a really historical interpretation.

⁴ Cf. Plato, *Symp.* 202 ff., especially 211 E: αὐτὸν τὸ θεῖον καλόν; *Phaedr.* 246 ff.; *Phaedo* 106 D: ὁ δὲ θεός . . . καὶ αὐτὸν τὸ τῆς ζωῆς εἶδος καὶ εἰ τι ἄλλο ἀθάνατόν ἔστιν. Aristotle, *Met.* 1072 b 28: φαμέν δὲ τὸν θεὸν εἶναι ζῶν ἀίδιον ἄριστον, ὥστε ζωὴ καὶ αἰών συνεχῆς καὶ ἀίδιος ὑπάρχει τῷ θεῷ. τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ θεός. Aristotle (*De Anima* 404 b 18) compares Plato's

interchangeable ideas" (E. Rohde, *Psyche*, English Transl., p. 243; cf. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos von Karystos*, p. 275).

Solmsen, on the other hand, thinks that in the later dialogues it is no longer the transcendent Ideas but the world and its soul that Plato regards as "Being in its fullness": for "to deny that the words 'Being in its fullness' refer to the Cosmos seems futile" (p. 80). Yet there can hardly be any doubt that this *παντελῶς ὄν*, which according to the *Sophist* (248 E ff.) includes Life, Movement, Soul, and Nous, is the same as *τὸ παντελὲς ζῶον* in the *Timaeus* (31 A ff.) nor can it be questioned that in the *Timaeus* these words are meant to refer to the transcendent Idea in likeness of which the Cosmos is constructed: "For that living Being embraces and contains within itself all the intelligible living Beings [the Ideas] just as this Cosmos contains us and all the other visible creatures" (30 C).

It is precisely in the *Timaeus*, to which Solmsen refers as evidence for his thesis, that the transcendence of the Ideas and of God is stressed even more strongly than in any of the earlier dialogues. Here the Cosmos and all its powers are called only secondary, "visible and generated gods" (28 B f., 40 D ff.) and Xenocrates in his paraphrase of Plato's theology is justified in regarding the World Soul as a "secondary god" under the "One" which is the "primary God" (frag. 15; cf. note 3 *supra*). Indeed how could the World Soul in Plato's eyes be the highest God if he defines it as a mixture of absolute and corporeal Being (*Tim.* 34 C ff.) and if Eros, the creative and motive power inherent in every soul, is not God but merely a Daimon (*Symp.* 202 D; cf. *Phaedr.* 246 ff.)? What Solmsen regards as Plato's gods in Plato's own opinion were rather "Daimons" and this is what they were actually called by his pupils.⁵ The transcendence of the true God made it necessary for Plato to introduce certain intermediate Beings who interpret gods to man and man to the Gods.⁶ This has always been considered one of the distinctive ideas of Plato's theology, an idea which Solmsen hardly mentions. For Plato, as for most Greek philosophers, the world no doubt was divine, was God, but for Plato the world was neither the only God nor the highest God. He envisaged a hierarchy of "gods and daimons" (*Phaedr.* 246 E ff.; *Polit.* 269 ff., etc.), and his pupils tried to bring these diverse aspects of the Divine into a consistent system.⁷

It is true that in his later dialogues Plato often emphasizes the

doctrine of *αὐτὸς τὸ ζῶον* and *Timaeus* 34 ff.; cf. Bonitz, *Index Aristotelicus*, 124 a 1, b 55.

⁵ Xenocrates, frags. 23 ff.; Aristotle, *Top.* 112 a 32. Plato distinguishes the Daimons from the Gods in *Cratyl.* 397 D; *Apol.* 27 E; *Phaedr.* 246 E; *Rep.* 392 A, 427 B; *Laws* 717 B, 730 A, 848 D, 906 A. Only where he refers to the poets and to popular religion does he use the term Daimon in the traditional sense of Deity (e. g. *Rep.* 391 E, *Polit.* 272 E). The passage in *Timaeus* 40 D can be interpreted in either sense.

⁶ *Symp.* 203 E ff.; cf. R. Heinze, *Xenokrates*, pp. 78-123; P. Valette, *Apologie d'Apulée* (Paris, 1908), pp. 220-32; F. Andres in *R.-E.*, Suppl. II, cols. 293 ff.

⁷ Aristotle, frag. 26, Rose = Walzer, p. 92; Xenocrates, frags. 15-28, Heinze; Speusippus, frags. 37 ff.; Eudoxus in Diogenes Laertius, VII, 89; cf. W. Jaeger, *Paideia*, II, p. 415.

point that the soul, as the principle of self-movement, is superior to the body which is only passively moved; but in doing so he never fails to suggest that just as the soul stands above the body, so the Nous stands above the soul, and that the Nous is God, is Zeus (*Tim.* 30 B; *Soph.* 249 E; *Phileb.* 28 E, 30 C; *Phaedr.* 246 ff.; *Laws* X, 897 B, XII, 966 E; cf. Diels, *Dox. Gr.*, pp. 288, 304, 309, 392). To Plato the Nous is not merely a secondary associate of the soul as Solmsen seems to think (pp. 113, 116, 133). In the passage on which Solmsen bases his whole interpretation of Plato's theology Plato expressly says that "the soul always takes in the Nous as God."⁸ The Nous—and the Nous is the intuition of the Idea—enters the soul from without and is "a daimon which God has given to each of us" and which "dwells with us" (*Tim.* 90 A ff.; cf. Aetius, *Placita*, IV, 5, 1). Since the true and highest God is the "One" God must be indeed "either Nous or even something *beyond* Nous" as Aristotle formulates it (cf. note 2 *supra* and Aristotle's quotation from Plato's lectures in *De Anima* 404 b 22).

No one who is aware of the difficulties and complexities of the subject will blame the author for not having presented a complete and adequate historical account of Plato's theology. Such an account would involve a penetrating and exhaustive interpretation of all relevant passages and a careful analysis of other sources and this cannot be done in a hundred pages. In spite of such omissions, and although opinions may differ as to the validity of Solmsen's conclusions, anyone interested in the problem will find in this book a valuable stimulus for further study.

E. FRANK.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

The Complete Roman Drama: All the extant comedies of Plautus and Terence and the tragedies of Seneca in a variety of translations. Edited, and with an introduction by GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH. New York, Random House, 1942. 2 vols. Pp. xlvi + 905, and pp. 971. \$8.00.

Here are presented in two thick volumes all the classic Roman plays that have survived to our time, and in addition, for good measure, the late empire *Querolus*. The books are stout and heavy. There are no doubt sound technical and commercial reasons for turning out this huge body of material in two volumes rather than in four, but the size adopted will not facilitate for the generality the gaining of an acquaintance with Roman drama. To be used with any degree of comfort they must be laid on a work-table, and

⁸ *Laws* X, 897 A: The passage might be slightly corrupted; its meaning, however, is clear and Proclus renders it: πᾶσα δὲ ψυχὴ θεῖα διὰ τοῦ θείου νοῦ, τὰς δὲ νοῦς θείος κατὰ μέθεξιν τῆς θείας ἐνάδος (*The Elements of Theology*, 129 [ed. E. R. Dodds, p. 114]; cf. *Theol. Plat.*, I, 12, p. 36: νοῦν γάρ φησι θείον προσλαβοῦσαν τὴν ψυχήν . . .). Solmsen seems to follow the emendation of R. G. Bury (*Loeb. Class. Library*, p. 340) who reads θεός instead of the θεόν of the MSS.

that suggests use by scholars only, and not by persons gallantly adventuring in literature. Let it be said of them, however, that they will lie open readily, a noble virtue in a book, and also that the maroon cloth binding is attractive, the paper as good as can be expected these days, and the typography excellent.

The suggestion has just been made that the volumes will, for sheer physical reasons, be used by scholars only, not by general readers, who would be better served through something less ponderous and therefore more manageable. But not by classical scholars; they would prefer the original text for causes to them intrinsically sound (of which, be it said, snobbishness is not one) and fully justified by experience. The scholars would therefore be students-at-large of the drama, persons interested in the subject-matter as such, and particularly in the technical construction of the various plays and in their relation to the development of the dramatic art. For them an encyclopaedic edition is desirable, no doubt, and this is certainly provided in the work under review. And not only that; it is provided, apparently, with some attention to the aim of making the edition sound and well abreast of modern scholarship in the rendering of the plays. Thus, for example, new versions of no less than thirteen of the twenty Plautine plays are given, of which eight are the work of the editor himself, while five represent genuinely up-to-the-minute attacks on the problem of translation by colleagues of his. The reason for this re-doing of two-thirds of the Plautine plays is, negatively, that Riley's versions in the Bohn Library are, in the words of the Random House editor, "unsuitable on every count," while Paul Nixon's well-known renderings are the property of the Loeb Library, and hence not available. Positively, of course, they must submit themselves to an inquiry into their merit as compared with that of Nixon's productions, and something will be said later on that point. Each play is furnished with a brief introduction and with absolutely minimal notes at its close, and a glossary of classical names is provided at the end of the second volume. There is also a general introduction of forty-six pages in the first volume, and, as this is the principal offering apart from the text of the plays, it is clear that an examination of it constitutes a main charge on the reviewer's attention.

This general introduction is, on the whole, of a sort to be intelligible to the classical student, and he, of course, is not likely to seek his information in such a place. As for the general student or the non-classical scholar for whom these volumes are presumably published, it is hard to see how they can derive any value whatever from the pages devoted to Pacuvius and Accius (xvi-xvii) or to Caecilius (xviii-xix), or how anyone can be profited in such a connection by lists of play-titles which are nothing after all but lists. The classical scholar may find in them a drift or tendency, but to anyone else they are about as edifying as the "begat" chapters of the Bible. Impractical also for the general student are the remarks on the metres of Roman comedy offered on pp. xxiv-xxv; the remarks are sound enough, and for the classical scholar are at least acceptable if not novel, but they are out of place here. There is a good deal said about Livius Andronicus, Naevius, and Ennius which seems extraneous to the whole subject of drama, and there are statements

made in that section with an easy confidence hardly warranted by the state of our knowledge, as, for example, p. xii: "At the close of the First Punic War there came a demand for better education and amusement; this provided the necessary stimulus for literature"; p. xii again: "It was Livius also who translated Homer's *Odyssey* into Latin for use as a text-book in schools"; while on p. xii and p. xiv one is left with the idea that Livius Andronicus began his dramatic career in 240 B. C. *sua sponte*. The reader, if curious at all, is left to wonder why the spirit descended on him at that particular time. Meantime, while a good many pages are consumed in what really belongs to a speculative introduction to the history of Latin literature for classical students, pronouncements on the worth of individual plays as plays are of the usual stereotyped character, and very little aid is offered the general student of the twentieth century who may be assumed, at least in our better colleges, to be getting the opportunity in departments of dramatics of forming some pretty fair conception of when a play is or is not a play at all. It might be better to leave him alone to apply for himself the main structural principles he is getting from his professor of dramatics than to bring forward, more likely to his obfuscation than for any other result, opinions of critics who never considered plays functionally at all but discussed them on the basis of certain general principles of literary criticism supposed to operate equally for epic and epigram, for history and histrionics. No doubt there are some such general principles, but they are not the ones that go to the root of the matter in plays, which must submit themselves to certain tests of reasonable verisimilitude to situations conceivable in real life and of probability in relation between one internal circumstance and another. In short, the General Introduction seems to ignore pretty successfully the very extensive and very penetrating inquiry of recent times into the very heart of the whole matter of play-composition and plot-development. Further, the present reviewer does not hesitate to suggest that there are not a few seniors or young graduate students, even in our depleted colleges of the war period, who could, given a little latitude and sense of freedom to speak out, provide more genuinely informative introductions to the individual plays than this edition offers, for the simple reason that their minds would not be cluttered up with conventional pronouncements, the value of which, if any, is related only to the history of criticism, while on the other hand they would understand, through merciless dissection of plots and through the effort of actually having staged numerous plays themselves, what is dramatically rational and what is dramatically incredible and impossible, and therefore intolerable. These remarks apply more particularly to the portion of the General Introduction which deals with the Plautine and Terentian plays and to the specific play-by-play introductions to the comedies of these two authors. What relates in the General Introduction or in the individual play-by-play introductions to Seneca appears to exhibit a more independent and less conventional approach to the subject in the editor, and seems to present possibilities of being really helpful to a mid-twentieth century student of dramatic art.

It is an oddity of the General Introduction that while for some modern writers book, chapter, and verse are given when they are

quoted or when reference is made to their views, for others this practice, which a reader has an entire right to expect, is wholly ignored. F. L. Lucas (xii and xli), J. W. Duff (xvi, xxx, and xxxv), W. Y. Sellar (xvii), C. H. Buck Jr. (xxi), Eduard Fraenkel (xxv), Gilbert Norwood (xxvi and xxxv), Lane Cooper (xxix), W. A. Oldfather (xxxiii), George Meredith (xxxiii), H. E. Butler (xl), and T. S. Eliot (xlvi) are either quoted verbatim or specifically referred to on matters of opinion without a reference being provided for one who might like to follow up a little more closely their views on the particular point under discussion. Very odd indeed is the sentence (xxxvii): "In a recent book about Seneca C. W. Mendel gives a typical argument." Has the law of copyright, which now operates in an incredibly silly manner to prevent even the most reasonable kind of quotation, got to the point that Professor Duckworth did not feel safe in even naming a recently published work? And why (xlv-xlv) do we read "in the words of Kastner and Charlton" followed by a quotation without any page reference, when Kastner and Charlton's work has already been named in a footnote to p. xl, where a specific page reference is given? It is no answer to say that classical students would know without fail to what works reference was being made, first of all because it would not always be true, secondly, because the General Introduction is not designed, or at all events should not have been designed, for professed classical scholars but for the relatively uninstructed generality. There is thus raised the suspicion of haste and even careless organization in the General Introduction to the work.

There remains to be said, as promised above, a word about the heavy contribution of the editor himself in translating eight of the Plautine comedies anew. The reviewer does not pretend that he has read them all and, over against them, the corresponding eight versions from the hand of Nixon; he has in fact studied closely only the two translations of the *Miles Gloriosus*, selected by him as being a fair testing-ground in a general way, and those of the *Epidicus*, because Professor Duckworth has recently brought out an exhaustive edition of this play and might be expected, in view of his labor on that, to display here if anywhere some superior technique of translation or accuracy of interpretation. From a close comparison of the versions provided for these two plays the reviewer brings back the judgment for what it is worth that no recognizable advance on Nixon's work is registered by these newest translations. Duckworth says "damned familiar," Nixon, more delicately, "deucedly familiar," and one may contrast, with the authors' names in the same order, "damn me for a poor fool," with "dash my luck"; "Juppiter damn you!" with "blast you!"; "posterior" with "dorsal regions"; "Oh hell! I'm done for!" with "Oh! this is awful, awful!"; "buddies" with "chums"; "slut" with "drab"; "to hell with him as far as as I'm concerned" with "no more of him for me!"; and the like. Neither of them—*maxima puero debetur reverentia*, I suppose—ventures on an honest "God damn you!" or soils the innocence of the American reader with "whore."

Perhaps it is because Nixon had already done such a good piece of work that it defied much betterment; indeed it is hard to see how anything much more satisfactory could be offered, on the whole,

than Nixon's fine contribution to the Loeb Library, that is, along the lines of standard translation. There remains only for some bold spirit the adventure of a somewhat modernized adaptation, a proceeding absolutely anathema to many classicists,¹ and yet for all that representing the one possibility of livening up the Roman comedies for a non-classical reader of today. Even Nixon's rendering of the *Miles Gloriosus*, which is about as merry as a strict translation can be, is a little sad for a man of 1945 A. D., and excites in the reviewer infinite compassion for anyone who tries to form some idea on that basis alone of what Roman comedy was like. The editor of the *Complete Roman Drama* has not altered the case one iota by the versions which he presents the reader. They are not different enough from Nixon's to merit of themselves a printing. The obvious conclusion is that they were done because the editor could not, on the one hand, stomach Riley's stodgy presentations, nor did he, on the other hand, possess the liberty of using Nixon's translations to complete his task. One is driven to the conclusion that the exigencies of publishers and not any conviction in the editor of having hit on better translations of the eight plays in question constituted the actual reason for the birth of Professor Duckworth's versions. From the standpoint of classical scholarship or that of a desire to lead non-classicists to a better way of apprehending Roman comedy as it was, the reason is not good enough.

In short, there seems to have been no special scholarly or literary purpose served by the publication of this work except that of providing a *corpus rei scaenicae Romanae* for the possible use of persons without knowledge of Latin, but with some grave limitations even on that purpose as has been already set out. The two sturdy volumes will fill with dignified appearance a considerable space on a library shelf, but from that space they will not often nor lightly be removed.

WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
BERKELEY.

MARTIN BRAUN. *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature.*
Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1938. Pp. xiii + 106.

This little, but closely printed, book contains a preface by no less a man than Arnold Toynbee, the outstanding historian of the English-speaking world, followed by two long chapters, one on "The National Character of Hero Romance," and the other on "Biblical Legend in

¹ Thus Gilbert Norwood reviewing the same work (*University of Toronto Quarterly*, Jan. 1944, pp. 235-6): "Such versions" (of ancient literature) "must show good scholarship, literary skill, and a firm refusal to 'popularize.' If ancient literature is to 'compete' with modern by a piteous attempt at contemporary manner, defeat is both inevitable and deserved." But Professor Norwood begs the whole question with his adjective "piteous"; we shall cheerfully agree with him that anything "piteous" is piteous, but we shall not contravene the rules of ordinary justice by insisting in advance that a thing must be "piteous" *ex natura rerum*.

Jewish-Hellenistic Literature." As correctly stated by Toynbee, Dr. Braun's study deals with little-cultivated marches of scholarship, but is all the more interesting for the relative obscurity of its theme. The author is a refugee from Germany, who was enabled by British friends to continue his research at Cambridge and Oxford after 1934. He thus represents in his own career a syncretism not altogether dissimilar from the syncretistic world with which he deals.

In Chapter I Braun deals successively with the hero-romance (i. e., *Heldenroman*) of Graeco-Oriental literature as illustrated by the romances of Ninus and Semiramis, Sesostris, Nectanebus, Moses, and Alexander. He discusses these romances with great erudition and good control of the pertinent recent literature. Not being himself an Orientalist, he occasionally comes to grief. Thus it has been shown by several Assyriologists since E. Meyer's pioneer study in 1912 (to which Braun refers) that the *Ahīqar* Romance (whose oldest MS, excavated at Elephantine and published in 1911, dates from the late fifth century B. C.) antedates the Persian period and reflects intimate knowledge of Assyrian officialdom in the early seventh century, as well as profound influence from cuneiform proverbs and animal fables. Under no condition can it have been composed after the Neo-Babylonian age. To say that it is colorless from the national and religious aspects and thus reflects the Persian period, is a very questionable assertion, since it abounds with praise of the Assyrian king and mentions several pagan deities. Braun contrasts this alleged internationalism of Aramaic literature in the Persian period with the national tendencies which he finds in the popular literature of the Hellenistic Age.

The author contrasts two strata of "national" literature, the first emerging from the better-educated circles at the top and largely composed in order to exalt the past achievements of their peoples, the other coming from the masses and reflecting their longings and aspirations. To the first he correctly attributes Berossus, Manetho, and Josephus, with some sound observations on the political purpose of their antiquarian researches. To the second he attributes the "popular anonymous literature of fiction in the Hellenistic world," with which he is directly concerned in this monograph. In this connection he quotes Plutarch on the great popularity enjoyed by the stories of Semiramis, Sesostris, and the Phrygian Manes. The last of the three Braun considers, following Ramsay, to have probably been an ancient Anatolian divinity. Against this must, however, be said that no such deity has turned up in the comprehensive pantheon of Hittite literature, which includes every possible Bronze-Age god or goddess of this region.

Some comments on the personality of Semiramis are in place. Contrary to the author's suggestion, Lehmann-Haupt did not "prove the historical reality of Semiramis" (p. 7), since this was already known to Assyriologists. Subsequent discoveries have made the situation clearer: Sammu-rāmat (whose name is not Assyrian at all but Aramaic, meaning "The Goddess Shammu [so!—the values of the sibilants were interchanged in Babylonian and Assyrian, as we know from scores of West-Semitic transcriptions] is Exalted") is the only queen-mother in Assyrian history who is treated in contemporary inscriptions as though she were the equal or superior of

the reigning king. As the official queen of the short-lived Shamshi-Adad V (823-810) she became queen-regent during the first five years of the reign of her son, Adad-nirari III (809-782 B. C.); for the relevant documents see the translations by Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, I, §§730-745. It follows that the Aramaic-speaking population remembered her not only because of the romantic prominence of her feminine figure in a historical world otherwise peopled almost exclusively by men, but also because she was herself an Aramaean princess—perhaps the first to reach such high rank in the royal Assyrian harem. In Syriac literature and later Aramaic and Armenian folklore, the name appears in its authentic Aramaic dress as *Shamiram*. There is not the slightest evidence for the hypothesis, shared by Braun, that Semiramis had any connection, original or posthumous, with Babylonia, or that the Babylonians accepted her as a national heroine. It is not accidental that she is omitted from the account of Berossus, who wrote as a Babylonian, as well as from Herodotus' account of Babylonia (discounting such questionable allusions as that to the "Semiramis" Gate of Babylon, which does not agree with our detailed knowledge of the topography of that city). With Braun's interesting observations about the Seleucid origin of the Greek Ninus Romance, and with the contrasts which he points between earlier Oriental and later Hellenistic treatment of similar situations, we heartily agree. At most we may hesitate to recognize any independent historical tradition underlying the story of the war against the Armenians (since the invasion of Armenia and Egypt by the Assyrians was a commonplace of historical tradition) or to admit a special "middle-class" motivation (p. 11), where we may better say "Hellenistic." This shift is due to a change in cultural pattern, not in social organization.—Some interesting new data about the romance of Ninus and Semiramis have recently been discovered by Doro Levi, in connection with his interpretation of mosaics found at Antioch, Alexandretta, and Apamea in Syria (*Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.*, 1944, pp. 420 ff.).

In dealing with the figure of Sesostris, Braun follows Sethe, giving a very judicious sketch of the development of the legend and its amplification in the Persian period, when Egyptian nationalism was keyed to fever pitch. It may be added that Sesostris was only one of a number of nuclear figures around which the Egyptian *Heldenroman* crystallized in the same period; cf. the remarkable studies of the late Wilhelm Spiegelberg on the Petubastis Romance and his monograph, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit von Herodots Bericht über Ägypten* (Heidelberg, 1926), which Braun has curiously missed, though it is of direct significance for his theme.

Braun's discussion of the Nectanebus Romance (pp. 19-25) contains some very interesting observations about its influence on the Amenophis legend (preserved by Josephus) and on the Alexander Romance, etc. This is perhaps the most original section of the chapter; the reviewer objects only to the author's statement (p. 23): "The Alexander Romance, also, bears the stamp of this Egyptian mentality which is fantastic and yet, at the same time, sober." As in so many of the current writings of refugees from central Europe, we find here again the stamp of racist thinking. The ambiguous term "mentality" is used for "disposition, character, reaction toward external

influences affecting the mind." There may be such a thing as "Egyptian mentality," but it cannot be clearly defined or contrasted with "Babylonian" or "Hellenic." All we can do is to contrast specific Egyptian reactions or classes of reaction in a given cultural phase (e. g., the Persian period) with similar reactions of other peoples at the same or different times. In this particular case "fantastic" seems to mean "disregarding the principles of classical Hellenic logic," while "sober" may be taken to mean "characterized by narrative simplicity." In other words, the Alexander Romance continues to reflect the prelogical imaginative life of the Orientals, who were not influenced by Greek logic until late and then inadequately. Its origin in the work of an unknown author emerging from a semi-literate milieu (which is a very different thing from the economic "middle-class" stratum mentioned elsewhere by Braun) is at least partly responsible for its simple style. It should be added that after the work of Meissner, R. Hartmann, and others, it is certain that the Alexander Romance owes more to Mesopotamian than to Egyptian sources (cf. my observations, *Am. Jour. Sem. Lang.*, XXXV, pp. 192 f.; XXXIX, pp. 15 ff.); see below on Braun's more detailed discussion of this work.

The author's discussion of the Moses legend, especially in Artapanus, is curiously one-sided. On the one hand, he has passed over the Judaeo-Hellenistic material on Moses in silence, except for Artapanus and Philo; on the other he seems to have overlooked the important philosophical movement of the *φυσιολόγοι*, which began in Egypt with the Pythagorean Bolus of Mendes in the second century B. C. (contemporaneously with the development of the early astrological school of Nechepso and Petosiris, for which see Cumont, *L'Egypte des astrologues* [1937], and Bidez and Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés* [1938]). The significance of the first body of material is that it attests the growth in Hellenistic Egypt of an Egypto-Aramaic legend of Moses, later syncretized with Hellenistic elements. This legend is best known from many references to the magicians Jannes and Jambres, who competed with Moses; on these figures see the collection of references from Jewish, Christian, and pagan sources by I. Abrahams (*Enc. Bib.*, II, pp. 2327 ff.) and Schürer, *Geschichte*, III⁴ (1909), pp. 402 ff., to which may be added an exceedingly important reference in the so-called Testament of the Zadokites (Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, II, 811), 7:19, which almost certainly dates from the last century of the Second Temple, i. e., from about the Christian Era. This last reference carries the Hebrew-Aramaic form of the name *Jannes*, *Yohannē* (often abbreviated as *Yannē* in contemporary Jewish literature) back to the early first century after Christ at the latest. For a further suggestion as to the origin of the name *Jambres* in a blend of *James* with Egyptian **ámre*, Greek *αὐθητός*, "sacred writing," cf. my remarks, *C. W.*, XXXVII (1943), p. 108. Since Braun's book appeared we have a greatly improved sketch of the origins of the *φυσιολόγοι* and the nature of their system (Sbordone, *Hori Apollinis Hieroglyphica* [1940], pp. xvii ff.), which makes it certain that the speculations of Horapollo, as well as of Plutarch, go back in large part to this source. Artapanus' attribution to Moses of the invention of hieroglyphic symbols is thus strictly on a par with his ascription to Abraham of the introduction

of astrology into Egypt from the East. In the late second century or the early first century B. C. such speculations were the order of the day. At best Artapanus was a renegade Jew to whom Jewish nationalism meant little or nothing.

In Chapter II, which is considerably longer than I, the author analyzes the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife as related in the Testament of Joseph and discusses its relationship, motif by motif, to Greek literature, classical, Hellenistic, and Christian. His analysis is very interesting and must be considered in general as eminently successful. He utilizes biblical and post-biblical Hebrew sources very effectively in order to point his Greek parallels and contrasts. There is only one serious omission which I have noted: the background of the story of Stratonice and Combabus which he touches on briefly, pp. 77 f. He is correct in calling it a "tale and cult-legend, originating from Hellenistic Syria," but it happens also to be an example of a widespread and immensely popular type of mythological legend, found throughout the East in the Bronze and Early Iron ages: see my treatment of the Story of Joseph itself in the light of this material, *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, XXXVII (1918), pp. 111-28, and for the Anatolian sources of the Combabus story see my observations, *Archiv f. Orientforschung*, V (1930), pp. 229 ff.; *Bull. Am. Sch. Or. Res.*, No. 78, pp. 26 f., n. 1; E. Benveniste, "La légende de Kombabos" (*Mélanges Dussaud*, I [1939], pp. 249-58), who deals with the Oriental after-history of the motif.

In sum we must thank Dr. Braun heartily for a most interesting and instructive monograph.

W. F. ALBRIGHT.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

H. E. WINLOCK. *The Temple of Hibis in El Khârgeh Oasis. Part I: The Excavations.* New York, Metropolitan Museum, 1941. Pp. xvi + 60 + 52 plates and charts. \$7.50. (Egyptian Expedition Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Vol. XIII.)

This is a volume which is easy to review, since letter-press, photographs, and plans are all on a high plane of excellence and it is extremely hard to find anything which may legitimately be disapproved. Dr. Winlock is known to all cultivated readers as America's foremost living Egyptologist and as director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art for many years, until his health broke. Since his retirement in 1939 he has published several volumes of archaeological reports, so the archaeologist is not so disposed to find fault with the *εἰμαρμένη* as he might be otherwise. In fact, thinking of Reisner's premature loss of vision, which practically compelled him to devote the last years of his life to making up long arrears of publication, one may be inclined to give thanks to inscrutable Providence.

The oasis of Khârgeh lies in the western desert of Egypt, about a hundred miles west of the Thebaid. Here, at the town known to the Greeks as Hibis, were excavated extensive remains of the last pre-

Christian and the first post-Christian centuries. Traces of Saite construction, from the sixth century, appeared, and Winlock was able to demonstrate that the pagan temple which adorns the site was founded by Darius I, shortly after the beginning of the fifth century. Building was resumed, after an interruption, by several Egyptian kings of the Persian period, especially by Nectanebus I (378-360 B. C.) and Nectanebus II (359-341 B. C.). The Lagide kings built a girdle wall around the older temple and added constructions at various places in the great temenos. There were also traces of Roman construction. In the fourth century the Christian population gained the upper hand, and Hibis became a Christian monastic center until its destruction by the pagan Blemmyes about the middle of the fifth century. Whether it was then entirely abandoned or not is not yet clear; in any case the oasis remained Coptic for several centuries thereafter.

The book is a model of clarity and precision and the temple which it describes merits peculiar attention because (in the author's words) "it constitutes the best-preserved structure in the style of the great Saite renaissance which immediately preceded its erection, and it shows that much which we have usually regarded as innovation of the Ptolemaic period was actually earlier." We congratulate the author on another outstanding publication.

W. F. ALBRIGHT.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

LUDWIG EDELSTEIN. *The Hippocratic Oath: Text, Translation and Interpretation*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Pp. vii + 64. (*Supplements to the Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, No. 1.)

The page-long Oath included in the Hippocratic collection has excited a considerable amount of scholarly comment. It is interesting not only in itself but because of the great influence it has had in the history of the medical profession. There are, however, certain persistent difficulties in the document, and the interpretations offered have varied widely from one another. Sometimes the Oath has been interpreted as an expression of medical ethics having a timeless validity, sometimes from the point of view of its historical origins. The present edition offers an entirely new solution, proceeding from the latter point of view. From analysis of the provisions of the Oath the author seeks to show that it is not a product of Hippocrates nor an expression of general medical ethics, but a Pythagorean manifesto, which he dates in the fourth century B. C.

Beginning with the stipulations that the physician shall not provide poison to a patient (with which to commit suicide) nor aid in producing abortion, the author reasons that since suicide and abortion were not contrary to general Greek feeling and ancient physicians regularly aided in their practice, the prohibitions can only be accounted for by definite philosophical beliefs, which can be found only in the Pythagorean school.

The discussion is then extended to include the other ethical provisions of the Oath, and in each case it is found that the statements

"can be understood only, or at any rate they can be understood best, as adaptations of Pythagorean teaching to the specific task of the physician. . . . Far from being the expression of the common Greek attitude towards medicine or of the natural duties of the physician, the ethical code rather reflects opinions which were peculiarly those of a small and isolated group" (p. 38).

Especially interesting is the discussion of the "operation-clause," in which the student says, "I will not use the knife, not even on sufferers from stone, but will withdraw in favor of such men as are engaged in this work." For centuries this was interpreted as reflecting the condition common until rather recent times, the separation of medicine from surgery. Then when it was recognized by Littré and others that the ancient physician performed many sorts of operations, other interpretations were suggested, as that castration, and not operation in general, was referred to. Edelstein shows that these explanations must be wrong, and that the Oath means just what it says: for him who takes it, operations are forbidden, but they may be performed by others. This corresponds with what we know of the Pythagoreans' attitude, for they valued surgery less highly than the other branches of medicine, while not rejecting it entirely. The explanation for this clause is to be found in the desire to maintain ritual purity. In a similar way, the Pythagorean initiate of the highest grade was forbidden to make live sacrifices or to eat meat, thus defiling himself with the blood of living creatures, but the regulations applying to others were not so strict.

Next the author takes up the "covenant," the group of promises in the first paragraphs of the Oath dealing with the pupil's relation to his teacher. Here the one swearing the oath obviously takes his place as an adoptive member of the family of his master. It has been usual to explain this as merely a figurative expression or as referring to a "family guild" of physicians, the Asclepiads. Edelstein points out that there is no adequate evidence for the existence of such a guild, but that the close relationship between pupil and master can be found in Pythagorean practice.

Such a summary as this can in no way do justice to the fullness and thoroughness of the author's treatment, which has produced sixty-one pages of commentary on one scant page of text.

The ethical provisions of the Oath have often been interpreted as the natural outgrowth of developing medical ethics, or as pioneering statements of an individual which set the tone of subsequent medical thought. This might be maintained in the cases of the prohibition of giving poison or of aiding abortion, the injunctions to sexual continence and professional secrecy, but it makes no sense whatever when applied to the expression on surgery, the emphasis on dietetic measures, or on keeping the patient from "injustice." While Edelstein's solution is not based on any positive evidence, it makes sense of a number of features of the Oath which can only be understood otherwise by the aid of bold conjecture, the assumption of corruptions, or interpretations which go against the plain meaning of the text.

It is perhaps surprising that if the document is Pythagorean we find no reference to the founder or to the mysteries of the society. If such features existed, however, their elimination can doubtless be ascribed to the same type of revision as that which produced the Ionic dialect-forms, bringing the Oath into conformity with the rest of the Hippocratic corpus.¹ This probably took place at a fairly early date, although the first mention of the Oath is in the first century of our era.

With regard to the date of the Oath, it seems doubtful whether the author is successful in his attempt to fix it in the fourth century. This is based almost entirely on the fact that "all the doctrines followed in the treatise are characteristic of Pythagoreanism as it was envisaged in the fourth century B. C." (p. 55). This means that most of the Pythagorean doctrines cited as parallel to the Oath are attested by Aristoxenus. But the doctrine which Aristoxenus is trying to depict is not that of the fourth century but that of Pythagoras and the early members of the school—*ἐκεῖνοι οἱ ἀνδρες*, as he frequently calls them; so that his testimony actually favors the possibility at least that the Oath is a document of the fifth or (less likely) the sixth century. The fact that some provisions of the Oath correspond to doctrines of Philolaus does not prove, surely, that the Oath must have been written during or after his lifetime (p. 57). Nor is the fourth-century date proved by the adoptive father-son relationship described. Edelstein supposes that this mode of transmission of doctrine would only be possible after the break-up of the Pythagorean societies in Italy in the latter part of the fifth century and the removal of most of the members to Greece proper. In earlier times the transmission "had been promoted by the society itself" (p. 58). A good deal of the evidence for the close relationships among members of the school goes back, however, to the early society, and even to the stories of Pythagoras himself.²

While the whole question of dating is perhaps impossible to settle with any precision at present, the testimony of Aristoxenus seems to point toward the fifth century. In placing the Oath in the history of Pythagoreanism we may be aided by a mention of Pythagorean medicine in the narrative of Timaeus.³ He says, "some of the members, falling into the practice of medicine through caring by dietary measures for those who were infirm, became leaders of that profession." In its emphasis on diet, this agrees perfectly with the concept of Pythagorean medicine which Edelstein has drawn from other sources and from the Oath; and the events to which Timaeus is referring may have occurred about 430 B. C.

A few smaller points of difficulty may be mentioned. In the translation of line 9, for *μαθήσοις*, perhaps "instruction" or "information" would be better than "learning." Among the examples of the giving of poisons by ancient physicians to their patients (p. 9, n. 10) is

¹ There is a certain unevenness in the text which may be connected with some such revision or adaptation. It consists mainly in the vacillation between infinitive and indicative, and between future and aorist, in clauses which ought to be parallel. Cf. W. H. S. Jones, *The Doctor's Oath* (Cambridge, 1924), pp. 7 f.

² Cf. Edelstein's references, p. 57, n. 9.

³ Iamblichus, *Vita Pythagorica*, 264.

Tacitus, *Annales*, XV, 64 (the death of Seneca). This is an extreme case, since Seneca's death had been decreed, and it is not comparable with cases in which poison was given to the hopelessly ill.

The student promises to keep the patient "from harm and injustice." In relating this to Pythagorean medical beliefs, Edelstein makes it purely a matter of the injustice a person can do to himself, as a result of wrong dispositions of the soul brought about by mistaken diet (pp. 21-4). He makes no mention of the maintenance of proportion, harmony, or the balance of opposites in the soul and also in the body, which probably ought to be brought into the picture.⁴

In a few instances the author seems to attempt to prove too much. For example, in regard to the injunction to sexual continence, he attempts to show that the expression of the Oath is not only in agreement with Pythagorean ideals, but "with the ideals of these philosophers alone" (p. 35). This is on the basis of the mention of justice and of the promise of equal abstention from illicit relations with male and female, free and slave patients, although Edelstein himself points out that the prescription of justice and sexual continence in themselves can be paralleled from the Hippocratic writings. Much the same thing can be said of his treatment of the promise of professional secrecy.

It is not necessary to suppose, as the author does (p. 49), that the Oath would have been administered at the end of the training, when the doctor was about to begin practice on his own. Indeed, it is perhaps more reasonable to assume that the student would be required at the beginning of his training to subscribe to the rules and practices of the profession or group. And there is no need to interpret the Oath as mentioning "another Oath, apparently sworn before instruction begins" (p. 49, n. 2) unless we wish to beg the question under discussion.

The author is troubled by the question of the payment of fees for medical instruction (p. 48, n. 30). He seems to think it likely that the Pythagorean physician who took the Oath would charge a fee to others than the children of his teacher. To be sure "the evidence does not indicate whether the Pythagoreans took money for instruction," but it seems highly unlikely. The examples of Hippocrates and of other philosophers are not decisive, because they lacked the peculiar close organization of the Pythagorean society. And in fact it is a mistake to suppose that the Pythagorean physician would charge fees to others simply because in the Oath the sons of his teacher are specifically exempted. Presumably these others, "pupils who have signed the covenant and have taken an oath according to medical law," would be adopted as his own sons, so that the one taking the Oath would not actually be receiving fees for instruction from anyone.

EDWIN L. MINAR, JR.

CONNECTICUT COLLEGE.

⁴ Diogenes Laertius, VIII, 26; Aristoxenus *apud* Diels-Kranz, *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*⁵, 58 D 1, 6, etc. Cf. also the theories of Alcmaeon, who was connected in some way with the Pythagoreans.

FREMONT RIDER. *The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library, A Problem and Its Solution.* New York, Hadham Press, 1944. Pp. xiii + 236; frontispiece.

This book has the intriguing, tantalizing suspense of a mystery story, less as a literary device than because the exposition of a many sided problem, like that of many clues, logically precedes the "solution," and, perhaps, because the solution not preceded by the exposition might seem fantastic and so fail to get the consideration it deserves. It is not a mystery story, however, and the reviewer's revealing the plot will not spoil the reader's fun.

The problem is not the scholar *qua* scholar, and the "future of the library" is, specifically, the problem of the growth of the library. And the solution is micro-cards.

The "four main factors of the growth problem" are purchase cost of books, physical preparation (binding and other minor operations), cataloguing, and storage. American university libraries have on the average been doubling in size every sixteen years. What the Yale Library will be like a hundred years from now is given as a really terrifying example. It "will, in 2040, have approximately 200,000,000 volumes, which will occupy over 6,000 miles of shelves. Its card catalog file—if it then has a card catalog—will consist of nearly three-quarters of a million catalog drawers, which will of themselves occupy not less than eight acres of floor space. New material will be coming in to it at the rate of 12,000,000 volumes a year; and the cataloguing of this new material will require a cataloging staff of over six thousand persons." And at that, as the author might well have emphasized, it will probably still fail to supply *every* one of its scholars with *every* thing he wants.

Micro-cards, as the author projects them on the basis of actual specimens with which he has experimented, will be the standard-size 3 x 5 in. (7.5 x 12.5 cm.) library catalogue cards of paper stock suitable to take microphotographic impressions and, at the same time, to stand the wear and tear of use. On the face of the card will be the usual catalogue information with some eliminations and some additions (notably an abstract) and on the back of the card will be the book itself, in micro-print, up to 250 pages (in case of more pages, a "card two" would be needed). The reader would borrow a micro-card instead of a book; the library's charging card would be filed in the catalogue in place of the micro-card; and the micro-card could be borrowed from author file, title file, or subject file, or all three (every book available in at least three copies). Or, instead of borrowing, the reader might have the micro-card copied at a cost of two or three cents. The scholar's reading would be done with a Readex apparatus—not to be confused with the microfilm reading devices to which the Readex is as much superior in convenience as the codex book is to the roll. And there is no decisive reason why Readex machines should not be as common as radios. Micro-cards would be produced and distributed either by commercial publishers or, preferably, by libraries in subjects in which they will have assumed "sponsorship," i. e. responsibility of comprehensive acqui-

sition of books. To the purchasing library, the cost of the acquisition of a 500-page book would be 30 cents (for micro-card) instead of \$5.00 (for book), cost of binding, etc., *nil* instead of 15 cents to \$1.50, cost of card filing 6 cents instead of 3, cost of storage *nil* instead of 44 cents (capital building and shelf cost). Further, though obviously with some reduction of this saving of some \$6.00 per volume ordinarily purchased (in case of gifts the saving is calculated at about \$1.30), the library would be the richer in resources in that, instead of ordering individual titles, it would place a "global subscription" for everything on a given subject—and at least three copies of everything (for filing by author, subject, and title).

Other suggestions which would increase the library's resources and its usefulness to scholars are "analytical" micro-cards of individual articles in periodicals and government documents, micro-cards of theses (perhaps theses would eventually be published only in micro-card form), and of manuscripts, etc.

It is not all plain sailing, of course. A second tantalizing feature of the book is that the reader notes down difficulties and objections from page to page, only to find them answered farther along in the book. Those which remain in the reviewer's mind at the end of the book are of three kinds: Considerations affecting the statistical and the dollars and cents estimates but not seriously affecting the general thesis; objections to some of the items of procedure, which, however, the author agrees are matters for further study, discussion, and, if necessary, agreement by compromise; and miscellaneous incidental differences of opinion which are irrelevant to the thesis except as they affect the general perspective with which the problem is approached. The reviewer is more hopeful than the author that "past attempts at solution" (weeding out, economies in method, and interlibrary coöperation) will be increasingly effective. The micro-card cost estimates do not, explicitly at least, take account of increased cataloguing cost (not really eliminated but transferred from library to micro-card publisher and bound to figure in his sales price). Item per item micro-cards would cost less than books, but the additional items purchased on the global subscription plan and on the other subsidiary recommendations would in large or small part offset the saving to the library budget as a whole. Also, of course, there would be additional costs for apparatus (Readex machines, etc.). The micro-card is not the complete solution; still to be bought, bound, catalogued, and stored will be books below the research level, reference material, "prestige material," material still subject to copyright. If copyright books are to be acquired as now and (p. 165) later on replaced by micro-cards, the corresponding micro-cards represent not saving but additional costs. The reviewer would not favor some of the proposed changes in cataloguing procedure, e. g. the "manipulating" of title entry to make it serve also as subject entry (p. 139).

Some of the author's statements about the scholar's methods of work are incorrect, or, at least, too sweeping, e. g. (p. 132) "In most cases he [the scholar] won't know in advance who wrote the articles he is after; and generally he won't even care," and (p. 152) "An out and out ecologist [or philologist] will wish to browse over the entire contents of each number as it comes out; but for research

use afterward, nobody is going to want *Ecology* [or *A.J.P.*] as a whole."

"Micro-cards—when?" With such reservations as to detail and with, frankly, some dread of the transitional "pilot plant approach," the "ultra conservative librarian would perhaps reply, probably not for two or three years, at best."

HENRY B. VAN HOESEN.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

(It is impossible to review all books submitted to the JOURNAL, but all are listed under Books Received. Contributions sent for review or notice are not returnable.)

Alexander (William Hardy). *Seneca's Dialogues VI, XI, XII (Consolations)*. *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Philology*, XIII, 2 (1944), pp. 9-48.

Bennett (Joseph D.). *Baudelaire: A Criticism*. Princeton, *Princeton Univ. Press*, 1944. Pp. 165. \$2.00.

Bukofzer (Manfred F.). "Sumer is icumen in"; a Revision. *Univ. of California Publ. in Music*, II, 2 (1944), pp. vi + 79-114; frontispiece, illustrations, and musical examples.

Chase (Mary Ellen). *The Bible and the Common Reader*. New York, *Macmillan Company*, 1944. Pp. xi + 316. \$2.50.

Coomaraswamy (Ananda K.). *Recollection, Indian and Platonic*, pp. 1-18; *On the One and Only Transmigrant*, pp. 19-43. Baltimore, *The American Oriental Society*. (Supplement to the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, No. 3, April-June 1944.)

Emeneau (M. B.). *Kota Texts (Part One)*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, *Univ. of California Press*, 1944. Pp. vii + 192. (*Univ. of California Publ. in Linguistics*, II, 1.)

Emeneau (M. B.). *The Sinduvāra Tree in Sanskrit Literature*. *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Philology*, XII, 19 (1944), pp. 333-346.

Flom (George T.). *The Morphology of the Dialect of Aurland (in Sogn, Norway)*. Urbana, *Univ. of Illinois Press*, 1944. Pp. 141. (*Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, XXIX, 4.)

Jones (Ernest). *Geoffrey of Monmouth, 1640-1800*. *Univ. of California Publ. in English*, V, 3 (1944), pp. 357-442.

Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. XXXVI, 1 (1944). Pp. 193-246.

Kelly (Sister M. Jamesetta). *Life and Times as Revealed in the Writings of St. Jerome Exclusive of His Letters*. Washington, D. C., *Catholic Univ. of America Press*, 1944. Pp. xvii + 173. (*Patristic Studies*, LXX.)

Maat (William A.). *A Rhetorical Study of St. John Chrysostom's De Sacerdotio*. Washington, D. C., *Catholic Univ. of America Press*, 1944. Pp. iii + 85. (*Patristic Studies*, LXXI.)

Percy (The) Letters: *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Edmond Malone*. Edited by Arthur Tillotson. Baton Rouge, *Louisiana State Univ. Press*, 1944. Pp. v + 302. \$3.50.



Schmitz (F. J.). The Problem of Individualism and the Crises in the Lives of Lessing and Hamann. *Univ. of California Publ. in Modern Philology*, XXVII, 3 (1944), pp. 125-148.

Sensabaugh (G. F.). The Tragic Muse of John Ford. Stanford University, *Stanford Univ. Press*, 1944. Pp. ix + 196. \$2.00.

Swedenberg (H. T., Jr.). The Theory of the Epic in England, 1650-1800. Berkeley and Los Angeles, *Univ. of California Press*, 1944. Pp. vii + 396. \$4.00. (*Univ. of California Publ. in English*, XV.)

Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, Vol. LXXIV. Edited by T. Robert S. Broughton. Lancaster, Pa., *Lancaster Press, Inc.*; Oxford, *B. H. Blackwell, Ltd.*, 1943. Pp. v + 306 + lxviii. \$4.00.

West (Louis C.) and Johnson (Allan Chester). Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt. Princeton, *Princeton Univ. Press*, 1944. Pp. ix + 195. \$3.00.

Zimmermann (Odo John). The Late Latin Vocabulary of the Variae of Cassiodorus, with special advertence to the technical terminology of administration. Washington, D. C., *Catholic Univ. of America Press*, 1944. Pp. xx + 277. (*Catholic Univ. of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature*, XV.)